The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXLI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1935 No. 3666

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 393
EDITORIALS:
Will Sanctions Lead to War? 396
An Industrial-Union Victory 397
Canada's New Deal 397
Roosevelt in the West 398
ISSUES AND MEN. "IF THIS BE TREASON." By Oswald Garrison Villard 399
CAN WE HAVE A HOUSING PROGRAM? I. By Albert Mayer 400
MUSSOLINI'S DREAM OF EMPIRE. A REVIEW OF THE ITALO-ETHIOPIAN CRISIS. By Maxwell S. Stewart 402
PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 64B. THE FOOTBALL BROADCASTER. By Left Wing 405
CANADA FLIRTS WITH FASCISM. By James H. Gray . . . 406
CORRESPONDENCE 408
LABOR AND INDUSTRY:
Crisis in the Teachers' Union: The Case for the Union. By Abraham Lefkowitz 410
The Opposition Replies. By the United Committee to Save the Union 411
Two Defeats for William Green. By B. J. Widick 412
The Higher History. By Heywood Broun 413
BOOKS AND DRAMA:
Poet's Quest. By Joseph Wood Krutch 415
A Milestone in Popular Education. By Maxwell S. Stewart . . 416
Revolutionary Fiction. By James Burnham 416
The Holy Blisful Martir. By Mark Van Doren 417
Two Proletarian Novels. By Helen Neville 417
American English. By George Genzmer 418
Shorter Notices 418
Contributors to This Issue 419
Drama: An American Tragedy. By Joseph Wood Krutch . . . 420

BOARD OF EDITORS
FREDA KIRCHWEY JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
RAYMOND GRAM SWING

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
MARGARET MARSHALL MAXWELL S. STEWART
DOROTHY VAN DOREN

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—DOMESTIC: One Year $5; Two Years $8; Three Years $11. CANADIAN: 50 cents a year additional. FOREIGN: $1 a year additional.

THREE WEEKS' NOTICE AND THE OLD ADDRESS AS WELL AS THE NEW ARE REQUIRED FOR CHANGE OF SUBSCRIBER'S ADDRESS.

THE NATION. Published weekly at 20 Vesey St., New York. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1897, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1935, by the Nation, Inc.

Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager. Walter F. Grueninger, Circulation Manager. Cable Address: Nation, New York.

THE ETHIOPIAN CRISIS has brought France and Britain to an approximation of the cooperation the French sought in the ill-fated protocol. Sir Samuel Hoare in his latest note does not explicitly pledge Britain to apply sanctions if Germany seizes Austria, but he reiterates the salient words of his historic Geneva speech backing the Covenant, and asserts that they mean precisely what they say. The French prefer pledges set down clearly in writing; the British prudently hold to abstractions which express present intentions without sacrificing altogether the liberty of future choice. But it is plain that Britain is now committed to defend Austria from unprovoked aggression, and France and Britain together are ready to become Austria's godfathers in place of Italy. This is important if League sanctions have to be applied against Mussolini. As Vienna now is oriented, Italy could count on receiving supplies from Austria, and through Austria from Germany and Hungary. The new Franco-British accord is developing organically in that military experts of the two countries are already discussing what concerted action to take under hypothetical conditions, presumably not alone against Italy. These are swift changes. Two months ago France had given up hope of obtaining Britain's support of collective security, and Laval's new friendship with the arch-realist Mussolini was the theme song of Paris. Britain was making the naval agreement with Hitler and presenting the Nazis with their greatest diplomatic triumph since Versailles. But already the Franco-Italian game is up, and the Anglo-German game too. Hitler is back in the diplomatic concentration camp, and can cement friendships only with Hungary and Poland. This he is doing, and the visit of Premier Gömbös to Berlin is preparatory to the formation of a bloc to offset the Little Entente and Russia's pact with Czecho-Slovakia. But this is a trifle compared with the importance of French and British cooperation and the revival of the League.

APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS against Italy if it attacks Ethiopia will not be anything like so drastic as a lay reading of Article XVI would seem to promise. There will be no automatic severance of diplomatic, financial, and economic relations between all members of the League and Italy. Instead, the powers will apply a principle of gradualism defined in little-remembered resolutions adopted by the League Assembly on October 4, 1921. Under these, the rupture of diplomatic relations may consist at first merely in the recall of the chiefs of missions at Rome. Economic sanctions likewise are to be gradual. The idea of the resolutions was that gentle sanctions were to be used first in the hope of accomplishing results, and should increase in intensity only if the recalcitrant state did not mend its ways. By these resolutions, too, it remains for members of the League to decide for themselves whether the Covenant has been broken. Thus it is certain that League sanctions will not be dramatic and impressive at first. And Mussolini no doubt is counting on a period of relative freedom from interference. The great problem no longer is to prevent the war, which appears inevitable, but to find a way of ending it at an early stage. Here the British and the French are trying to reach an understanding with Mussolini, who has whittled down his original demands to a remarkable degree. But as he still insists on a settlement based on the 1906 treaty, and includes the corridor from Eritrea to Italian Somaliland through Ethiopia west of Addis Ababa, the League is sure to reject it. Russia, Turkey, and Rumania voted against the Council adopting the Madariaga proposals as going too far toward placating Italy. The League will insist on a League settlement, which Mussolini simply cannot accept and remain in power. The peace may be even more dangerous for Mussolini than his war.

THE PROBABILITY that the League will ask American aid in applying non-military sanctions against Italy gives special importance to the study recently completed by the Geneva Research Center analyzing the types of cooperation possible under existing legislation. The study found that the neutrality act, despite the absence of the clause making its application optional with the President, would be an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

asset rather than a liability in case the United States decided to cooperate. Although the act must be applied both to Ethiopia and Italy in case of war, Italy alone is likely to be in the market for any considerable amount of war materials from the United States. The League powers would be not only free but in honor bound to take care of Ethiopia's legitimate demands, while Italy would be dependent solely on non-League states for essential supplies. America's embargo on munitions would be automatic under the neutrality legislation, and the crucial issue is whether Italy would be able to continue to purchase cotton, oil, scrap-iron, and other raw materials in this country. To what extent these commodities will be classified as "implements of war" under the act remains to be determined, but the report suggests that legally all might be included in the ban. The President also has the power to cooperate with the League in withdrawing diplomatic representatives from Rome and in non-recognition of any situation created by Italy in Ethiopia in violation of the Kellogg pact, and he could acquiesce in a League blockade. The Johnson act prevents Italy from floating loans in this country, though it does not rule out short-term credits. The one sanction that the United States could not apply without special legislation would be a boycott of Italian imports. If the League invokes this sanction, it is possible that the American public would back an unofficial boycott rather than shoulder the responsibility for the success of Italian aggression.

THE ANTHRACITE INSTITUTE, which practically governs the hard-coal industry, seems hardly grateful for a recent free lesson in economics. For five years there has been a trade in bootleg coal so thriving that this year its operations may reach $50,000,000. Miners thrown out of work by the closing of the big companies' shafts have squatted on the coal lands, dug their own small shafts, and taken out enough coal to earn a living. The bootleg-fuel industry, with its thousands of pits, its fleets of trucks, and its sales organizations, has assumed the proportions of a major business. Bootleg coal is sold from $2 to $4 a ton cheaper than legitimately mined anthracite. Coal companies, dealers, and railroads have used every means in their power to halt the traffic, but the unemployed miners and truckers have presented a formidable opposition, and have had the support of labor and at least the tacit encouragement of the Pinchot and Earle state administrations. Now, the mighty Anthracite Institute itself has entered the fight. Walter Gordon Merritt, its general counsel, has threatened "very drastic action," implying the use of force if necessary, to halt the "piracy."

WHATEVER the ethical implications of coal bootlegging, the Anthracite Institute chooses to ignore its economic significance. It is in large measure because of the outlaw coal traffic that anthracite conditions are at a six-year peak and that a new spirit of hope pervades the Pennsylvania fields. From Shamokin, the center of the bootlegging industry, it is reported that men working illegally on one coal company's land successfully negotiated the reopening of two abandoned slopes and are back at work, having given up their illicit business. At Centralia hundreds more will soon return to work under a similar arrangement. At Pottsville an independent company which grew out of bootleg operations has been granted an operating lease by the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company. In other words, the bootleg miners themselves, organized as independent companies, are taking over, and running at a profit, the abandoned holdings of the large companies. There has been a general reversion to small-scale mining, and while it is fairly certain that this situation cannot long endure, it has more than served its purpose by revitalizing the anthracite industry and giving employment to thousands of miners.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT and the price-raising school of economists would do well to make a close study of recent economic developments in the Soviet Union. In the past year the benighted Bolsheviki, who doubtless have never heard of Professor Warren and think of Foster as the Communist candidate for the President of the United States, have recklessly cut prices on all their products. And instead of suffering from unemployment, wage reductions, and curtailed production, as everyone knows they should, they have been perverse enough to step production up 25 per cent above last year's level and increase the wage scales slightly. The result has been an unprecedented rise in living standards. Retail-trade turnover for the first half of 1935 was 34 per cent above that of the corresponding period of 1934. The abolition of the ration system—which has now just been completed by removing the restrictions on meat, fish, butter, and potatoes—has returned millions of rubles to circulation which were formerly hoarded in the villages, and made unnecessary the issuance of new money to take care of the growing trade turnover. Meanwhile, the railways, long the weakest link in the Soviet economy, have taken a new lease on life under the direction of Kaganovich. Car loadings in August averaged more than 70,000 a day and exceeded the plan by 5 per cent. During the first eight months of the year the railroads received 53,000 new cars, almost twice the number produced last year. Could it be possible, Mr. Roosevelt, that the only persons who really gain from rising prices are the entrepreneurs and speculators?

COTTON PICKERS ON STRIKE in Alabama—they are demanding a dollar for picking a hundred pounds of cotton—report eight known deaths among the members of the Share-Croppers' Union. Numerous persons are missing, many have been beaten, and about a hundred are in jail. In Arkansas, where the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, several thousand strong, called a strike beginning September 23, three men and one woman were jailed on the day the strike began "for agitating a strike of cotton pickers." The prisoners have not been allowed to communicate with union officials or attorneys and they will probably be charged with violating an Arkansas law against "inciting labor" which is designed to defeat just such movements as the present strike. In Arkansas, too, the demand for which the croppers are taking their lives and liberties into their hands is for one dollar a hundred pounds. Our readers are already familiar with the unbelievable conditions of poverty and terror under which the Southern cotton pickers live. They know too that the strikers in both Alabama and Arkansas need support and help of every sort. At this particular time we urge that telegrams and letters be sent to Governor Bibb Graves at Montgomery, Alabama, and to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sheriff C. H. Wilson at Blytheville, Arkansas, protesting against the denial of civil rights and the outright gun play with which the cotton pickers' strike is being literally beaten down. Such protests do carry weight. In Birmingham the cases of Robert Wood and R. F. Hall, charged with violating the infamous Downs ordinance, have been dismissed for lack of evidence; in Bessemer, Alabama, Ed Sears, a Negro, sentenced to ten months on the Alabama chain gang and a fine of $100, has been freed by Judge Gardner Goodwin of the Circuit Court, who ruled the ordinance unconstitutional. The croppers can scarcely hope to come off with their lives, let alone obtain their meager demands, without outside help.

AFTER READING newspaper accounts of the latest American Legion convention one wonders just who these rowdy juveniles are who behave every year according to the same violent pattern. Thousands of them take possession of the favored city—and it is worth noting that competition for the honor is keen between rival communities—they shoot craps on street corners, they get vociferously drunk, they push each other off the running boards of automobiles, they drop furniture out of hotel windows, they become maudlin over the dear old flag, they pass resolutions against communism and un-Americanism, and they demand the bonus. One wonders who they are and then one admits, somewhat ruefully, that in real life they are ordinary, sober citizens. The legionnaires at St. Louis undoubtedly constituted a fairly representative cross-section of the American middle-class population. What a legionnaire thinks is thought every day by our old friend, the Man in the Street. He thinks about money, which is to say that he wants some, but does not allow his desires to be complicated by curiosity about where the money is to come from: the Legion bonus resolution called on Congress to consider the bonus question without reference to "issues of government finance or theories of currency with which the Legion does not intend to become involved." He thinks about reds and about patriotism: he would sever relations with Soviet Russia and fingerprint American citizens; he would have peace and a big army and navy. And he thinks about cutting loose and having a good time. Being safely away from home and out of the sight of neighbors and bosses, he whoops it up with his buddies in memory of the brave old days when leaving home was a patriotic duty.

KNICKERBOCKER VILLAGE in New York City, a limited-dividend housing project, was designed to substitute modern, low-rental apartments for the slums that had once occupied the same ground and to create a new type of community living. The tenants, taking these promises at their face value, organized a democratic tenants' group, the Knickerbocker Village Tenants' Association, to protect their joint interests and to create a genuine community life. They found it necessary to protest against refusal of the owners, the Fred F. French Company, to live up to the building specifications. Employing a policy of non-cooperation with the tenants' attempts to adopt an extensive social, recreational, and cultural program, the management has resorted to every destructive method, from arousing racial prejudices by whispering campaigns to physical intimidation. It has started a red scare, has sponsored rival tenant organizations, and has subsidized a paper that consistently attacked the first group. Now thirteen leaders of the association have been refused renewal of their leases, although each has satisfied the State Board of Housing, which supervises the renting, of his qualifications for tenancy. The board, which has not taken action in any of the many flagrant violations of tenants' interests until forced to it by tenant pressure, disclaims power to act in the present dispute. Supreme Court Justice Rosenman denied the K. V. T. A. appeal for a writ of mandamus to force the board to intervene; as a result the thirteen evicted tenants are being refused a hearing.

A LETTER from Langdon W. Post, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, and subsequent information obtained at the Authority's offices necessitates several corrections in and additions to the editorial comment on the Astor housing project in *The Nation* for September 25. The project was one of renovating a group of old-law tenements in New York City; the aim that of determining whether or not renovation could be done more cheaply than new construction. The result will be a number of tenements almost entirely rebuilt from plans which adequately meet the requirements of modern multiple-dwelling construction—not from antiquated plans as we were erroneously informed—and, most important of all, at a rental of $6 a room. The cost of "renovation" was as high if not higher than if the buildings had been started on a vacant lot. The low rentals were made possible because the land was bought for considerably less than current lower East Side prices and because there was in effect no labor charge for the job, the work being done under relief auspices. The essential shortcomings of the project were that it was too small for satisfactory community housing and too limited to start any general break in land values. Considerable difficulties, moreover, arose from the fact that labor on the job was supplied under three jurisdictions—FERA, TERA, and New York City relief. Although the New York Housing Authority was not at fault, our assertion that bureaucratic red tape interfered with prompt and effective work appears to have been justified.

IN *THE NATION* for September 18 we printed an excellent review of George Seldes's "Freedom of the Press," by Alexander Crosby. A little later we were a bit surprised to see in the *Saturday Review of Literature* another review by Mr. Crosby of the same book, and we were still more surprised a few days afterward to discover a third in the *New Masses*. It was, however, only when we opened the *Guild Reporter* (organ of the Newspaper Guild) and found the initials A. C. affixed to a fourth extended notice of the Seldes book that we began to feel some absence of discretion in Mr. Crosby's zeal. Nor is the situation improved by the touch of irony incident to the fact that Mr. Crosby warmly supports the Seldes thesis concerning the tendency of monopoly to nullify the technical freedom of expression guaranteed by the Constitution; and we cannot but admit that if four unfavorable reviews by the same man had appeared in four reactionary publications we should have been among the first to protest. As a member of the Newspaper Guild, Mr. Crosby should at least be a bit more scrupulous about sharing a job!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will Sanctions Lead to War?

IN voting to deal with the Italo-Ethiopian conflict under Article XVI of the Covenant, the League of Nations has taken what is everywhere admitted to be the most fateful step in its history. Should Mussolini proceed with his projected invasion of Ethiopia in defiance of the League, the application of the penalties specified in Article XVI will be automatic. An act of war against the African kingdom now becomes legally and irrevocably an act of war against every member of the League. Never before, not even in the case of Japan, has the League had the courage to take this action. In fact, it was generally believed before the inception of the present crisis that the punitive measures listed in Article XVI were wholly impractical, and it had been proposed that they be struck from the Covenant in the interest of realism.

Even today, with the preponderance of the peace sentiment of the world strongly behind the League, many sincere pacifists are seriously disturbed by the trend toward sanctions. The leadership of the British Labor Party, for example, has split three ways on the issue. Dissenting from the action taken by the majority at the recent Trades Union Congress, the party's parliamentary leader, George Lansbury—a life-long Christian pacifist—is against sanctions because they may involve the use of violence. Certain prominent members of the Socialist League, notably Sir Stafford Cripps, have opposed them in the present crisis on the ground that they merely tend to strengthen British as against Italian imperialism. Expressing a somewhat similar attitude Frank Simonds, in a letter printed elsewhere in this issue, denies that there is any moral distinction between the continuation of the British occupation of Egypt and Mussolini's threatened seizure of Ethiopia. Behind this lies the fundamental problem whether it is either ethical or desirable for the peace forces to throw their support to the great empires which are endeavoring, out of self-interest, to maintain the status quo.

We do not dispute the accuracy of the picture which Messrs. Cripps and Simonds have drawn. England's dramatic stand at Geneva has been by no means as disinterested as the speeches of its representatives would imply. But nothing that England has done or is doing in Egypt justifies Italian aggression. Nor because certain interests favor sanctions for selfish reasons does it follow that pacifists should reject the one device which offers hope of preserving peace. If the Japanese general staff had believed that the League would enforce Article XVI in 1931, there would be no Manchoukuo today. While fear of sanctions may not dissuade Mussolini at this late date, it is at least certain that no other step carries even a remote possibility of stopping Italian aggression. Moral force, world opinion, and the outlawry of war have little meaning to a dictator who prides himself on his scorn of all principles. To follow the advice of the cynic and do nothing not only would condemn ten million Ethiopians to the fate suffered by thirty million Chinese in Manchuria but would encourage similar international brigandage the world over. Sanctions fill the same position in the international sphere as the police and courts of justice occupy within the nation. They may not prevent all irresponsible acts of violence, but they can keep the guilty party from benefiting from conduct that is deliberately anti-social.

An instinctive mistrust of armed force is wholly justified even when the force is directed by an international agency. A war to preserve peace would probably be no less destructive and no less futile than a war to make the world safe for democracy. But does this mean that the multitude of men and women who desire to see war abolished are caught in an inescapable dilemma? Are military sanctions in support of the status quo the sole alternative to allowing dictators to overrun defenseless states and exploit millions of innocent and helpless persons? If these were the only possibilities, the choice would be difficult. But the dilemma is obviously a false one, calculated to beguile unwary pacifists into the same camp as their fascist enemies. Commercial and financial sanctions are not acts of violence, but if rigorously applied they would eventually be as effective against Italy as military action. Closing the Suez Canal would achieve the same objective in much less time. It is not necessary to deprive Italian women and children of essential foodstuffs, or even to establish a naval blockade. The type of control which most countries already exercise over foreign trade should furnish the groundwork for an effective administration of sanctions without the utilization of military or naval force.

Of course it is theoretically possible for Italy to resist an international embargo by declaring war against one or all of the states participating in the action. Mussolini's bold declaration that "sanctions mean war" has misled many persons who would otherwise be inclined to support international punitive measures. But to believe that he would actually carry out his threat is to assume that Il Duce has lost every vestige of the shrewd political sense which has maintained him in power for the past thirteen years. No dictator is likely to be mad enough to plunge his country into a war in which it must inevitably be defeated. The danger of war exists only when sanctions are applied by one or two countries—which is just the contingency the League is seeking to avoid through collective action. But even granting that the aggressor might retaliate under exceptional circumstances, the risk of a prolonged and general war would still be remote as compared to the danger that an illegal war would spread once it got started. Any community, national or international, which neglects law enforcement for fear of retaliation on the part of the lawless elements must pay the price in resultant anarchy.

Sanctions are not intended to solve the war problem in its entirety. They are of no assistance in eliminating the causes of international conflict. Nor are they in any sense a substitute for arbitration, conciliation, or agreements for the equitable distribution of raw materials and markets. Sanctions are valuable only in restraining countries from settling their disputes by armed force. But from the standpoint of this generation, nothing else is of such pressing importance. Neither peace nor justice is possible without law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Industrial-Union Victory

THE victory of the United Mine Workers, who won a $90,000,000 wage increase after a perfectly mobilized strike, is first of all the success of bread-and-butter unionism. John L. Lewis can boast that he has increased the wages of his bituminous workers by $350,000,000 in three years, and so has demonstrated to his membership that their union, from a purely business standpoint, is a remarkably profitable investment. His latest victory was possible because of his authority in the negotiations with the coal operators, and because when the strike was called it was completely effective. It was also the result of several other important factors, not the least of them being that the operators were unable to force their conflict into the White House and enlist the President as arbitrator. The President left negotiations where they belonged as long as the public interest was not more seriously jeopardized, in the Department of Labor, and there Assistant Secretary McGrady conducted them with signal skill. The coal operators, with lively memories of the President's intervention in the automobile crisis, had relied on their access to him when it came to resisting the union demands. Like most employers, they counted on government help when management faced a victory of its workers. But the coal strike was an economic struggle such as the Supreme Court has blessed. So the President wisely refrained from intervention and the strike was quickly won. The terms of the victory are not generous. The average annual income of miners is still low. The six-hour day is still to be won. But the union now is assured of eighteen months of an improved standard of life, and can go into the experiment of reorganizing the bituminous-coal industry with renewed courage and prestige.

This victory, on the eve of the American Federation of Labor convention at Atlantic City, brings to that meeting a message both of warning and of hope. It was a bread-and-butter victory, and the A. F. of L. is the stronghold of the bread-and-butter doctrine. But it was significantly something more, a victory of an industrial union on a scale that no craft union is able to duplicate in present-day America. John L. Lewis comes to Atlantic City as the most successful American labor leader of his time. He also is the outstanding critic of the federation's paralysis in organizing industrial unions in modern mass-production industries. He can demonstrate that the industrial union is a better instrument than the craft union for winning wage-and-hour victories. He also knows that the industrial union is the one hope of organizing and uniting labor in this country and giving it something like equal power as against management under modern conditions. We imagine that the rank and file of the craft unions would not be unresponsive to this persuasion, but the bureaucracy of the federation will be hard to convert. The success of industrial unionism would mean a new deal in the federation; it would mean that the power of the bureaucracy would pass to others. Though it is essential that there be a new deal and that the power should pass, the craft-union control will not be surrendered without a conflict. Lewis's victory is a warning that the conflict is now at hand. He towers above other leaders in the labor movement, and with his union solidly behind him and with ample financial resources, he must be understood as promising that the industrial union will come into its own, either through the A. F. of L. or without it. If the federation could lift its eyes from minor considerations and look to the plight of American workers in the machine age, it would see that the craft principle, however logical historically, is now a menace to labor as a whole. In the United Mine Workers the A. F. of L. possesses an experienced army, with plenty of staff officers to organize new industrial unions in a way the federation itself is unable to do. And within the federation are enough industrial unions, such as the needle trades, the lumber workers, and the brewery workers, around which newly organized industrial unions could rally. Here would be the nucleus of a genuine labor movement. Instead of groping forward toward this opportunity, the federation chiefs intend at Atlantic City to whittle down the San Francisco resolution committing them to organize new industrial unions. They are preparing to retreat from the compromise position they reluctantly adopted last year. For this reason Lewis in his new strength will stand as a warning which, for the sake of preserving the federation, we can only hope will be heeded.

Canada's New Deal

ON October 14 Canada will go to the polls and repudiate the Conservative government which has been in power for the past five years. This is as certain as was the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, and for precisely the same reasons. The Conservatives have had the misfortune to be in power during practically the whole of the world depression. Although Premier Bennett is much more aggressive than former President Hoover, his political philosophy is practically identical with that of the Great Engineer. Like Hoover he is an extremely wealthy man for whom politics is an avocation, and his government has reflected his class interests. Both look upon the tariff as a panacea for all economic difficulties, and Bennett's treatment of the relief-camp strikers at Ottawa and Regina, described by James H. Gray elsewhere in this issue, has reacted against him in much the same manner as the massacre of the bonus marchers reacted against Hoover.

Since 1867 Canada has cast its vote on the pendulum principle—"the Conservatives have accomplished nothing for us, let us try the Liberals" and vice versa. With few exceptions, each five years has witnessed a change in government, and recent provincial elections make it plain that the swing is now definitely toward the Liberals. In the past few years all the provinces but two have turned out their Conservative governments and installed Liberal ones. The two exceptions are Manitoba, which is governed by a Progressive-Liberal coalition, and Alberta, where the new Social Credit Party recently won an astounding victory over the incumbent Farmer-Labor government.

Opposing Mr. Bennett in the national election are three national parties: the Liberals under former Premier MacKenzie King; the new Reconstruction Party headed by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

former Conservative Minister of Trade, H. H. Stevens; and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation under James Wadsworth. Although assured of an overwhelming victory because of the dissatisfaction with the present regime, the Liberals can scarcely be said to present a clear-cut alternative program. Traditionally, like the Democrats in the United States, they have stood for low tariffs, although like the Democrats they have done very little to bring about reductions when they have been in power. In line with this policy they have urged a reciprocal tariff agreement with the United States, together with a substantial British preference.

Mr. King is also entirely consistent with his laissez faire principles in opposing artificial price controls and agreements in restraint of trade. He falters somewhat, however, in advocating the nationalization of Canada's new central bank, in desiring to keep the Canadian National Railways in government hands instead of merging the system with the Canadian Pacific, and in favoring a national commission to administer unemployment relief, provide work, and supervise unemployment insurance. These and other economic inconsistencies in the Liberal platform can doubtless be explained by the fact that it has been drawn up chiefly with an eye to opposing the Conservatives on every issue.

The appeal of the Reconstruction Party centers around the admitted ability and integrity of Mr. Stevens, who has a large public following as a result of his courageous attack on certain of Canada's most powerful corporations in the price-spreads study which he made while a member of the Bennett Cabinet. An able speaker, he is accused by his enemies of demagoguery. Although he advocates the redistribution of wealth, he is no radical. He would salvage the national economy by highway construction, reforestation, housing, development of mineral wealth, and expansion of tourist traffic, and pledges his party to establish uniform wages and hours throughout the Dominion and to enact legislation incorporating the recommendations of his Price Spreads Commission.

Unless there is an unexpected shift in opinion between now and the elections, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, better known as the C. C. F., is expected to emerge as the official opposition party. Judging by the provincial elections, the Conservative representation in Parliament will be all but wiped out, and the Reconstruction Party is not expected to make much of a showing in its first campaign. Especially strong in western Canada, the C. C. F. is expected to win from thirty-five to forty seats in the national parliament of 245 members. The C. C. F. is definitely committed to socialism without the name. Formed on the basis of previously organized farm and labor groups, it has made its greatest progress in recent months among intellectuals. Though not opposed to private property as such, it would attain control over the big industries by democratic and constitutional means. It favors non-contributory unemployment, sickness, and old-age insurance, rigid regulation of wages and hours of work, and legislation giving workers a share in the management of industry. It also would encourage farmers' cooperatives to save the farmers from the banks and mortgage companies. Because of the striking similarity between the program of the C. C. F. and that of the American third-party movement, its vote will be followed with close interest on this side of the line.

Roosevelt in the West

THE President's Western trip is first of all an exploration to discover political temper. This imponderable is measured by the appearance and moods of railroad-station crowds and by reports brought to the Presidential train by local politicians. Until he left Washington and established these personal contacts the President could not be certain just where he stood. Now he is sure. His popularity remains. That is not to say that the enthusiasm for him is the same as three years ago. Then he was the crusader, promising to battle for human betterment. Now he has battled, and for the farm belt, at any rate, he has achieved something. The crowds he has been meeting are more prosperous and much more cheerful than when he saw them last. Whole towns are turning out to welcome him, and his reception is hearty enough to convince even the Republican newspaper correspondents. The President's informal speeches show him yielding to the allurement of speaking of the depression as being over. The temptation in the presence of farmers whose well-being to some extent has been redeemed must be great. And with industrial profits and government revenue rising, he obviously hopes to campaign with the argument, once a Republican monopoly, that business would be disturbed by a change of administration. He is not admitting to the farm belt that higher agricultural prices are due primarily to the drought and not to the AAA, and he makes no allusion to the alarming fact that business is settling down to make its higher profits in an economy in which unemployment is around a steady ten million.

His speeches have not been notably vigorous. The spectacle of Boulder Dam, one might have hoped, would have convinced the President of the future of public works, and of the duty of the state to continue to carry through enterprises beyond the scope of private initiative. Instead, he used his words of dedication to turn back to private business the responsibility of finding work for the country. "In two and a half years," he said, "we have come to the point where private industry must bear the principal responsibility of keeping the processes of greater employment moving forward with accelerated speed." What do these words mean? Are they merely exhortation? If so, does the President believe sweet tones from him will induce private industry to increase employment? Or is he giving up the responsibility of the government to create genuine work when private industry fails to assume its responsibilities? For he must know as well as anyone that business today gives little promise of bringing about an early and large increase in employment.

The budget message was released to coincide with this speech. It demonstrates that the deficit for the year is substantially less than had been forecast. As the savings are due primarily to the failure of spending agencies to get rid of money once allotted to them, they are not a convincing demonstration of economy, and the President can hardly hope to satisfy his critics that they are. But he is trying to convince business that the New Deal is safe and sane, which confirms the growing belief that the days of reform are past.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

"If This Be Treason"

I AM not a dramatic critic and am, of course, leaving to Joseph Wood Krutch technical criticism of the new play "If This Be Treason," written by John Haynes Holmes and Reginald Lawrence, and produced by the Theater Guild at the Music Box Theater in New York City. But I cannot deny myself the opportunity of expressing my admiration for the excellence of the acting and the courage of the play and of calling attention to its extraordinary timeliness. There were moments when it stirred me as I have rarely been stirred at the theater. If the movement was not always as smooth as it might be; if there was, to me, considerable artificiality at points, the play still stands out in my mind as remarkably moving and as an honest, straightforward effort to portray dramatically the greatest problem which confronts the world. And this at the very moment when there is being fought out at Geneva the issue whether one nation shall or shall not be allowed deliberately to rob and despoil another nation and to murder its citizens by wholesale for the piratical purpose of adding to the attacker's land and riches.

It is easy to understand the indignation which "If This Be Treason" will arouse in many super-patriotic bosoms. If the Admiral commanding the Brooklyn Navy Yard, who so glibly urged in the Hearst papers not long ago our joining hands with the Germany of Hitler and with other countries to make war upon Russia, were to enter this theater he would have to be tied at the end of the first act. He would certainly call upon the heavens to fall and crush those who dare to portray a President of the United States as refusing to go to war with Japan after that country had attacked Manila and killed or wounded a thousand American sailors and marines. Others will seek to ridicule the whole thing and to declare that it is all preposterous. Its critics cannot, however, charge that the authors have failed to present the pro-war argument, for several of the characters in the play voice it in the fairest and most forceful manner. It is only the "unpatriotic" character of the play upon which they can dwell, the "impossibility" of the denouement, and the general lack of what they call reasonableness and sanity.

Yet the central thesis of the play is exactly that which we see being worked out in Geneva—that conferences between the heads of nations to make peace should be held before hostilities begin instead of afterward, when the multitudes have been slain, robbed of their lives, tortured to their last hours, without ever having been asked whether they were willing to make the sacrifice. If I remember rightly, in backing up the British government the other day President De Valera of the Irish Republic made exactly this same argument. The time to make peace is certainly when the battalions are marching, when the troop ships are on the tide with their holds jammed with death-dealing instruments. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Lawrence put their hero to the supreme test by having him sworn in as President just as Japan strikes, when the outgoing President has apparently enmeshed the country in the conflict, and Congress, stampeded by the warlike elements, is ready to declare war upon Japan. Whether the solution, the revolt of peoples against governments, is within the range of human possibility is the moot point. But however the people may decide the question for themselves, there was never a greater necessity for laying this problem before the American public than today, in view of the overwhelming vote in Congress for the neutrality legislation which the President first opposed and then grudgingly accepted. I am bold enough to believe that this play will meet with a popular response wherever it is shown, and I wish it could be put on in every city in the land. If the country had any sense of what is important and vital and true, all sorts of medals and honors would be showered upon the authors, and upon the actors, who add so much to the sincerity of the performance.

There are two aspects of the American war situation which have been strongly accented in this play. The first is the horrible ease with which men in high position forget the personal side of war when the crisis nears. They seem wholly to divest themselves of the ordinary emotions of humanity when the bands begin to play, and salve their consciences by prating the conventional arguments about national honor and the insults to the flag. When Woodrow Wilson addressed a great Red Cross meeting in Washington soon after the outbreak of war, there was a smile upon his face as he said to his audience that we had only just begun to fight, and had only just begun to receive the lists of dead and wounded. His mind was closed to any effort to realize the enormity of the suffering which he had inflicted upon individuals, upon families, by putting the country into war—after having told me and others that no matter what happened he never, never would do it. Somehow or other, pity, compassion, and mercy seemed to go out of this man and out of the souls of so many others in high office when war was declared. Hence, though one may doubt whether we could ever have such a brave and humane President as Mr. Holmes and Mr. Lawrence portray, one knows that the possibility of choosing such a President ought to be held up constantly to the American people.

Secondly, I come back to my old thesis that war has now become such a monstrous thing, so diabolical in all its aspects, and so certain, as we all now know, to ruin victors and vanquished alike, that no one man, no small group of men, no Congress should have the right to declare war. The Congress of the United States has lost the war-making power guaranteed to it by the Constitution; it has been usurped by the Executive. All the more reason that the Executive should be compelled to disgorge that power and that we should establish the rule that no war may be declared save by a referendum vote of the American people.

Oswald Garrison Villard

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can We Have a Housing Program? I.

By ALBERT MAYER

OUT of the Administration's semi-efforts at housing in the last two years, it has become quite clear that nothing significant will eventuate. The final stage has been President Roosevelt's recent decision, at the Hyde Park Hopkins-Ickes conference, to cut public housing funds still further. The public must dig beneath the glittering phrases still used by government officials and grasp that this is the virtual abandonment of low-rental housing.

The housing vagaries of the Administration result from the fact that it has never visualized housing as a central issue of vital importance in the life of the people, but only as one of many unrelated sources of emergency employment. Housing is an excellent means of steady employment, but the government through its blundering has never got far enough to find this out. We need not go over the well-known dreary statistics of the government's inaction and its inner contradictions, though it is useful to examine the reason for them. We must now look forward, reorient and revitalize housing thought, state the new objectives, and study how to achieve them. The need for thinking and action is urgent, for, paralleling the President's announcement, recent moves in Washington indicate that the Administration is turning to private residential construction to supply adequate reemployment and in some magic way to reach rentals and accomplish things that it has never been able to do here or in any other country.

In formulating a program a number of elements must be considered which are not new but which have hitherto been inadequately considered: the impending shortage of housing, which may well become so intense as to have all the dangerous possibilities that drove Europe into enormous housing activity after the war; the necessity for considering urban, suburban, and rural housing and planning as an interrelated whole instead of as a series of isolated incidents; the necessity for mobilizing and correlating all possible public and private agencies to undertake a really large program; the projection of these elements against national capacity to produce, with particular reference to preparation of a chaotic building industry for such a task; consideration of the cost of such a program and the taxation required to finance it; vigilance to prevent taxation for necessary subsidies for low-rental housing coming out of the pockets of those who require the subsidies; a solution of the legal problems, as between locality and central government, which have arisen during the two years of the emergency program.

There are three conceivable possibilities: first, to let purely private enterprise do what it is willing to do, with inducements from the government; second, a policy which would provide for subsidized public low-rental housing of a livable standard, while allotting to private enterprise all it could be expected to handle, in as orderly a way as possible under existing conditions; third, a program based on an untrammeled capacity to produce. The first can be shown to be not only wholly inadequate but ultimately disastrous. The second needs to be developed rather fully because it appears to be the most immediately feasible. Enough will be said of our capacity to produce housing to indicate what we may one day enjoy. Though there is no adequate solution for the housing problem within capitalism, yet I do not propose that we should all sit around writing essays until capitalism ends in this country. The example of Europe, especially that of England, where conditions are in so many respects like ours, shows that a great deal can be done.

We must understand that the reasons for the Administration's failure were largely gratuitous rather than inherent. Most important was the lack of first-rate housing minds to think a program through, and inattention to the advice of those who were there. Not the President, not Hopkins, not Ickes ever met any first-rate men intimately or talked with them long enough to get any comprehension of the problem. Moreover, the various isolated agencies which were created nullified one another's purposes. For instance, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would bail out a mortgage and revivify the owner in some area where the PWA was trying to assemble land for slum clearance; the Federal Housing Administration might refuse a loan which it found had been accepted later by the Federal Home Loan Bank; the FHA might be insuring a modernization loan in a district where the PWA was trying to make an assemblage. Failure to coordinate the agencies is inevitable when they are basically incapable of coordination, established for purposes that are incompatible. And finally in the PWA, the agency charged with slum clearance and low-rental housing, there was an almost unbelievable series of gratuitous errors, sudden reversals of policy, petty bickerings, arguments about procedure. I as an architect can draw plans and write specifications as quickly for a public agency as for a private client. But if I don't get a contract, if I'm not told what to do, if I find out my client hasn't got the land yet and doesn't know what size and shape it is going to be, I'm licked. That sort of thing has been happening for two years in the PWA.

Housing, which can create regular reemployment and constitute a far greater stimulus to industry than any made-work project, has been so harried for instantaneous results that it has never got started at all. No one even in the government has ever known how much money it commanded, because varying amounts have been allotted, taken away, reallotted, and taken away once more. If architects and planners had been at work right along, a tremendous program could now be ready.

Failing to understand the purely adventitious reasons for its own failure, the government now plumps for private work. From the latest news, it has brought in Peter Grimm, an able real-estate broker, and Harold Riegelman, an able real-estate lawyer, who, sitting in with three or four building-material-supply men, will presumably formulate a new housing policy. At least for the next few days. While these men are no doubt able in their particular fields, it is downright ludicrous to expect that their experience or training fits them to deal with one of the most complicated and serious problems facing the nation today.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This failure to formulate clearly and then act has been due to the lack of important pressure for intelligent housing. The existing pressures are those of subdividers, building-and-loan associations, and the building-material industry. They have pushed the FHA, with its insured private loans and speculative building, into the foreground of Administration plans. To show how inadequate this will be, we must once more consider what housing is.

The slum and the blighted district—urban and rural—are only the most spectacular manifestations of the bad conditions under which almost all of us live. The people who live in slums can't afford to live in decent places. Those who can afford to don't get anything really satisfactory, unless they shift around with the shifting, sprawling city and suburb. Lack of play spaces and convenient parks, noise, exposure to traffic accidents, encroachment of business, overcrowded roads and streets and subways—these affect the well-to-do only in less degree than they afflict the poor. The well-to-do shift to new areas, and the poor move into the abandoned unsatisfactory areas. If this sounds an exaggeration to anyone, let him simply visit the derelict areas that were good neighborhoods twenty, fifteen, ten years ago.

Thus the housing problem is twofold. First, there is the lack of reasonable planning and stability which makes our entire physical environment unsatisfactory. Then there is the problem for something like two-thirds of our population who haven't the money to pay for physically decent housing—whose income or relief wage or relief dole is not enough to pay the sum of real-estate taxes, current interest and amortization on cost of land and building, and adequate maintenance. On top of these permanent elements there is the impending housing shortage, which will affect both groups. The problem of the two-thirds is bluntly one that involves redistribution of wealth. The physical solution is similar for all: planning and construction of projects on a sufficiently large scale so that they can be free from traffic dangers and extraneous noise, can contain facilities for recreational and community life, and can achieve the economies of large-scale planning and its amenities of proper orientation to air and sunlight. Such projects must be so related to the larger community of which they are a part that they are within convenient reach of daily work, of shopping districts, of larger recreational and park areas. They require continuity of physical existence instead of the present constant shifting—reasonable continuity of tenure by tenants and continuity of management.

Private enterprise as now constituted cannot alone cope with such a problem even on its purely physical side. It is essentially small-scale. It builds twenty houses here, forty houses there—each group vulnerable to any adjacent development because of its small size. It cannot provide the desirable group amenities because the overhead is too great for the relatively small number of houses. It cannot provide continuity because essentially its motive is to buy and sell quickly. Aside from its inability to create individual projects on an adequate scale, neither its technical personnel nor its available capital suffices to embark promptly on a large volume of work. It cannot supply a steady amount of employment, for it builds furiously in a boom market and stops completely in a depression.

A variation of private enterprise is the limited-dividend corporation which in Europe did a good deal of the housing for the top stratum of the lower-income group and for the middle-income group. Cooperatives, labor groups, industrial groups, and others, aided by government subsidies and rigidly controlled by the government, did much good work on a large scale. But it must be emphasized that even these agencies never reached 90 per cent of the low-income group, as England and Germany found, and they cannot do so here. Such corporations, building with even a 3 per cent mortgage rate, cannot provide a room rent of less than about $8 or an average monthly family rent of less than $28 including heat, or a yearly rent of less than $336. As one-fifth of income is the maximum that should be paid as rental by persons of low income, the limited-dividend corporation even with a low mortgage rate cannot properly house those with incomes of less than $1,680—which, on the basis of income figures available, shows that the lower two-thirds of the population cannot be reached without a much greater subsidy. Actual operating experience of the Hillside limited-dividend corporation in New York indicates that the $8 room rental is an understatement. With 70 cent land and a 4 per cent interest rate, rents are $11 a room. At a rate of 3 per cent, and assuming a little saving on land, rents would come to $9.80 a room. With all conceivable pinching, including smaller rooms, they might be got down to less than $9.

Let private enterprise have as large a part as it is capable of playing in a large construction program. In England, public and private housing enterprise are both at work in their respective fields, and private builders are unprecedentedly prosperous, despite the fearsome predictions often made here that the government would put private construction out of business. But the unfortunate results of trying to place it in the major or exclusive role can be seen in the operations of the FHA. This is the government agency which insures loans made by private institutions to private builders up to 80 per cent of appraised value. Originally its technicians worked out procedures for a sound program. However, the pressure to insure loans has been so great that these standards are either distorted or simply not observed. For instance, the FHA marks out "good areas" where the development seems satisfactory. In those good areas it insures loans to the builders of a few houses here and a few houses there—precisely the sort of spotty procedure that has always blighted originally good areas, and will do so again. Because of the 80 per cent loans, the shoestringers with land can get by with practically no capital of their own—the usual boom-and-collapse situation. I have seen some of the actual buildings insured by the FHA. The planning is not particularly different, the quality of construction no better than the usual speculative job—the first large development in Washington which the FHA has publicized as showing the speed of its work is particularly shoddy in quality.

As long as it bears the whole brunt of construction revival and is harried to make loans at an ever-accelerating pace, the FHA is inevitably doing the same kind of job that private lenders did under similar breakneck conditions in boom time, and it will achieve the same unstable results. But if it were considered only as one of several avenues for reviving building, if it could take the time and pains, it would have a unique chance, as the main source of funds, to improve the character of private work, though it could in no case meet the needs of the low-income group.

The new element in the situation which may force the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government away from its preoccupation with private speculative building is the impending housing shortage, which may well result in a sudden upsurge that will more than supply the pressure hitherto lacking. In a price system, effective demand—that is, financially adequate demand—determines how much product will be made available. But this holds only to the point where human endurance breaks away. Ernst Kahn, certainly not an emotional or radical thinker, says, "A housing shortage, like the deprivation of any necessity, is a sizzling social and political bomb." This sudden demand or a more gradually accumulating powerful pressure we must develop if we want a housing program.

Consider the reasons we accept as sufficient to cause the formulation of a large interrelated housing policy and immediate program, and how they are answered by those unsympathetic. First there is an anticipated shortage, the reason for it being increasing number of families, high birth-rate twenty years ago and consequently high marriage-rate now, marriages postponed because of depression, doubling up, six-year construction stoppage, normal elimination by fire, and so on. Various estimates indicate that a program of from 1,200,000 to 1,600,000 dwellings a year for the period 1935-45 would leave us in relatively the same position as in 1930. But the concept of shortage involves a concept of minimum standard. Standards of living and nutrition are far below 1930; why not those of housing? Shall we see simply more doubling up, more occupancy of shacks? Re-employment being the only objective, the Administration relies on the temporary volume of speculative housing for those who can afford it.

Another argument for our housing program is the social cost of bad housing in crime, in disease, in blighted lives, in gangsterism. The usual answer to this is that people with slum habits won't improve in new environments; and it would be unfair to those who invested their money in slums to stop subsidizing them by our taxes and to create good low-rental communities with the money. We must stress again the indisputable wastes of small-scale building as against large-scale community planning, both initially and in the creation and abandonment of successive ruined areas with their wasted streets and utilities. But stopping this would certainly lessen the scope of differential speculative opportunities, which would be un-American. A large steady housing program would mean a saving of money now spent on the dole. But some prefer the dole; others prefer constructing non-competitive roads, sweeping non-competitive leaves, making non-competitive surveys.

Thus the important arguments that appear self-evident to proponents are met with far different answers by opponents, by the exploiters of housing. These arguments are inherent in the formula, "Leave it to private enterprise"—a formula the government has come to adopt, retaining the verbal trimmings of better housing.

We must leave the ivory tower of good reasons, and mobilize the good reasons in terms of powerful pressure. I have indicated that I believe a sudden upsurge of such pressure is likely in the near future when physical overcrowding and misery burst the dam of economic inability. We must offer and push an immediately practicable program to provide the housing. In my next article I shall outline such a program.

[*Mr. Mayer's second article will appear next week.*]

Mussolini's Dream of Empire

A Review of the Italo-Ethiopian Crisis

By MAXWELL S. STEWART

A YEAR ago Ethiopia was only a name to most well-informed persons. They knew, perhaps, that it was the last surviving independent state in Africa, and possibly that it was the only kingdom in the world which could boast that it had never felt the imprint of a conqueror's heel. But beyond this the average man knew little and cared less. He was never quite certain whether Ethiopia or Abyssinia was the correct name for the country, or whether the two were adjoining nations. That most Ethiopians belonged to the oldest African Christian church—founded by Frumentius in the fourth century—that the emperor claimed to be descended from Solomon through the glamorous Makeda, Queen of Sheba, and that a large part of the country, though located within ten degrees of the Equator, was cool and suitable for European habitation were facts that were not known to one person in a thousand.

Today the attention of the civilized world is focused on this backward, poverty-stricken kingdom with its glorious past, not because of anything which it has achieved, but because one man in Rome has determined that it shall be free no longer. Whether Mussolini has been forced into his Abyssinian adventure by circumstances beyond his control or whether he has deliberately chosen Ethiopia as a place for Italy to seek its manifest destiny is, of course, impossible to determine; but the result as far as Ethiopia is concerned promises to be the same.

The first inkling that the outside world had of impending trouble was on December 5, 1934, when a serious clash was reported at Ualual in which 32 Italian and 110 Ethiopian soldiers were slain. Emperor Haile Selassie immediately accused Italy of having encroached upon Abyssinian territory, and asked that the dispute be arbitrated in accordance with the Italo-Ethiopian treaty of 1928. Mussolini replied with characteristic arrogance, refusing arbitration and insisting on satisfaction for the "unexpected aggression" of the Ethiopian troops. He demanded that Ethiopia apologize, salute the Italian flag, and pay a $100,000 indemnity. On December 14 the Ethiopian government officially called the attention of the League of Nations to the gravity of the affair; and on January 3, having received no satisfaction either from the League or from Rome, it invoked Article XI of the League Covenant and requested that immediate measures be taken to safeguard peace.

In the face of the conflicting stories told by the Ethi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opians and the Italians, it has been difficult to ascertain exactly what happened at Ualual on December 5. Trouble is known to have started, however, when the Joint Anglo-Abyssinian Delimitation Commission, charged with demarcating the boundary between Ethiopia and British Somaliland, arrived in Ualual and found an Italian military force in charge of the wells. Confronted with an "unconciliatory and disobliging" attitude on the part of the Italian officer in charge, the British members of the commission decided that it had best withdraw, leaving its Ethiopian escort "in its position in order to avoid the appearance of a retreat, which might cause a rising among the population of Ogaden." What happened after the commission departed may never be clear, but it is reasonable to suppose that there was provocation on both sides. No one knows who fired the first shot, but the fact that Ualual lay at least a hundred miles inside Ethiopian territory had never been disputed by the Italian government prior to the outbreak, though it subsequently attempted to establish an Italian claim to the region. As late as December 16, 1934, the *Stampa,* a Turin paper, carried a map showing Ualual in Ethiopia—a slip which was remedied on December 25 when it published another map showing the town in Italian Somaliland. The library of the League of Nations contains a 1925 Italian map, which, on the basis of the 1908 boundary changes, shows Ualual to be a hundred miles from the Somaliland border. Needless to say, these maps have no juridical value and their existence does not necessarily imply that Mussolini was untruthful in asserting that Italian troops had occupied the oasis for five years without protest. However, Italy has never offered any explanation of why this border incident, differing little from many which had occurred in the past, should have been made the basis for extreme demands against Ethiopia. The suspicion that it was merely seized upon as a pretext to justify prearranged plans for the conquest of the African kingdom is deepened by the report—first published by Vernon Bartlett in the London *News-Chronicle* —that as early as July, 1934, Signor Mussolini had commissioned General Badoglio with the task of investigating the cost and nature of a campaign against Abyssinia.

Accusations of this sort cannot, of course, be definitely proved, but there is no other hypothesis which so completely fits all the known facts. In the first place, it is consistent with Mussolini's avowed political philosophy. For years he has been telling the Italian people of the necessity of colonial expansion. He has glorified the sword, and heaped derision on those who placed principle above expediency. Ethiopia appeared to be the one country where these megalomaniacal cravings could be satisfied without too great risk of defeat. Moreover, some means had to be found to overcome the growing severity of Italy's economic crisis. In each of the past three winters there have been more than a million unemployed—a tremendous number for a country with as little industry as Italy. Drastic deflation has caused a sharp decline in wholesale prices and successive reductions in wages without bringing a corresponding decline in the cost of living. In order to protect its trade balance, the Fascist government instituted a series of import restrictions which has resulted in a grave shortage of foreign supplies. The national budget has shown large deficits annually since 1930-31, and the gold reserves have been severely depleted.

Conquest of Ethiopia promised not only to divert public attention from these immediate hardships but also to yield some of the basic raw materials which Italy so seriously lacks. While Ethiopia's resources are in the main uncharted, it is known to possess coal, iron, and possibly oil—elements essential to industrial development which are almost wholly absent in Italy. Haile Selassie's domain is also well-adapted to the growth of high-quality, long-staple cotton, which Italy now obtains almost exclusively from foreign countries. To develop these resources would require a considerable amount of capital—more than Italy has readily available—but a country that is dazed by the glitter of prospective riches can scarcely be expected to count the cost. Meanwhile, war preparations have speeded up domestic industrial activity and greatly reduced unemployment. Some months will probably elapse before the Italian people, buoyed up by the propaganda and war psychology, realize that this "prosperity" must be paid for in reduced living standards.

At Ethiopia's urgent request the League Council placed the Ualual dispute on its agenda for the January session. But after much maneuvering behind the scenes, the powers persuaded Italy to agree "in principle" to arbitration as provided by the 1928 treaty, and thereupon postponed official action until the May session of the Council. The League had scarcely adjourned before another frontier clash occurred in the vicinity of Ualual, costing the lives of five Italian Somali soldiers. It soon developed, moreover, that fundamental difficulties still stood in the way of arbitration. Italy insisted that the arbitrators be limited to the attempt to discover responsibility for the Ualual outbreak, and refused to allow the question of boundaries to be discussed. Rome also objected to the appointment of foreign legal authorities as Ethiopia's representatives on the arbitration commission.

As the weeks dragged on without a prospect of settlement, both countries began to arm themselves while protesting against the other's warlike preparations. Italy, especially, made it plain that it was ready for any eventuality. The first special detachment sailed from Italian ports in the middle of February, and by July over 100,000 soldiers had passed through the Suez Canal bound for the Italian colonies. Including the portion of the army normally on duty in Eritrea and Somaliland, together with native troops, Mussolini had close to 300,000 men in East Africa by the end of August. The Ethiopian army—counting reserves—is believed to be about twice this size, but not more than 100,000 possess modern military equipment.

Alarmed by the steadily increasing number of Italian troops massed on the Ethiopian frontier, Haile Selassie invoked Articles X and XV of the Covenant. The League, however, continued to ignore the issue, chiefly because the powers could not envision any action which would not involve unfortunate repercussions on the European situation. Events had played into Mussolini's hands, and he was quick to take advantage of them. Hitler's bold announcement of German rearmament had centered the attention of the world on Central Europe. At the Stresa conference in April and the subsequent special session of the League Council, France was interested primarily in cementing Italian support against Germany. To assure this it made no move to take back the promise of a free hand in Africa which it had made in January. The British government is known to have taken its expert on Ethiopia to Stresa, but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not seem to have had the courage to broach the subject to the Duce. It was not until the regular session of the Council in May that the Ethiopian question finally received consideration. And then the time appears to have been spent mainly in an effort to devise a formula which would not offend Mussolini. This was finally achieved, and the Council adjourned after passing two resolutions. The first called attention to the fact that arbitrators had just been named to settle the Ualual incident and that both disputants had agreed to fix August 25 as the date on which the procedure of conciliation and arbitration should be concluded. The second provided for summoning the Council on July 25 if the four arbitrators found themselves unable either to settle the main issues or reach an agreement on the selection of a fifth arbitrator, and on August 25 if a final settlement had not been achieved by that date. No attempt was made to halt Italian war preparations during the interval, as had been specifically requested in Emperor Haile Selassie's appeal of May 20.

The conciliation commission met at Scheveningen on June 25, but after two weeks of futile discussion it suspended its sessions, being unable to agree on the scope of its reference. The Italian members of the commission continued to insist that the arbitrators be limited to the Ualual incident, while the Ethiopian representatives wished to discuss the larger aspects of the controversy, including the boundary problem. As the commission deadlock was still unbroken on July 25, the League Council was again called into session. Finding Mussolini absolutely intransigent on the question of the scope of arbitration, the League yielded and instructed the commission to proceed without delay to designate the fifth arbitrator. The larger issues concerning the fate of Ethiopia were left to a subsequent meeting in Paris which—again at Mussolini's insistence—was to be attended only by Great Britain, France, and Italy, the signatories of the tripartite treaty of 1906. This treaty, a relic of the pre-war imperialist scramble, delimited the sphere of interest of each of the three powers in Ethiopia and provided that no one of them was to interfere in Ethiopian affairs "except in agreement with the other two."

But old-fashioned diplomacy proved no more successful than the League had been in finding a way out of the impasse. Although England and France went so far as to offer Italy control of the Ethiopian gendarmerie, communications, and post office, together with substantial economic and territorial concessions, the proffer was emphatically turned down by Mussolini. Il Duce's blunt rejection had at least the merit of destroying any illusions regarding the nature of Italy's aspirations. For the first time the world realized that war was practically inevitable. England was the first to react. The members of the British Cabinet were summoned from their vacations to consider what Mr. MacDonald described as "the gravest crisis since 1914." While the exact nature of the policies agreed upon at that extraordinary session was never announced, the British attitude at Geneva showed unmistakable signs of stiffening, and was backed by a series of "precautionary" military and naval moves. Reinforcements were dispatched to Malta, additional aircraft were sent to Egypt, and various units of the Atlantic fleet were shifted to the Mediterranean.

Since two-thirds of Abyssinia's frontiers border British territory, London is naturally intimately concerned with the outcome of the present crisis. For more than thirty years Britain has had an understanding with the Ethiopian government that a dam should eventually be built at Lake Tana as an aid to irrigation in Egypt and the Sudan, and the entire region surrounding this lake was recognized as a British sphere of interest in the tripartite agreement of 1906. Tory opinion is greatly exercised, furthermore, by fear lest the establishment of a strong Italian military and air base in Ethiopia may endanger the road to India. The 10,000,000 votes rolled up for sanctions in the recent peace ballot have probably also contributed to the strengthening of British policy at Geneva. England was apparently first to realize that failure to curb Mussolini would destroy all moral grounds for collective action against possible Nazi aggression.

By the time the League Council assembled on September 4 to make a final effort to settle the controversy, it was evident that only the most vigorous measures would halt Mussolini in his bid for empire. The report of the arbitration commission, unanimously declaring that neither Italy nor Ethiopia could be held responsible for the clash at Ualual on December 5, forced Italy to relinquish its claims for an apology and an indemnity, but had no effect on any of its major demands against Abyssinia. At the opening session of the Council the Italian representative, Baron Aloisi, presented an elaborate dossier accusing Ethiopia of having violated its treaty obligations and having failed to keep the promises made when it joined the League in 1923. He pointed to the existence of slavery as proof that Ethiopia was not worthy to associate on equal terms with the "civilized" members of the League, and declared that under the circumstances Italy must reserve "full liberty of action" for the security of its colonies.

The slavery issue had been previously exploited in the Italian press to illustrate the necessity for bestowing the benefits of Italian civilization on the backward Abyssinians. But this was the first time that Mussolini had had the audacity to ask that the League sanction his projected Ethiopian campaign on grounds of international morality. It is true that a form of serfdom exists in Ethiopia, but steady progress is being made toward its elimination. Edicts were issued in 1924 and 1931 prohibiting slave trading, freeing all children born of slave parents, and providing for the liberation of all slaves on the death of their masters. While it has proved impossible to enforce these regulations in many of the more remote portions of the country, the same thing might be said of similar laws in the neighboring French, British, and Italian colonies. The Slavery Report of the League (1935) gives Ethiopia credit for its achievements in recent years and condemns practices closely akin to slavery which prevail in Eritrea. Incidentally, Mussolini was one of the few strong supporters of Ethiopia's entry into the League in 1923, when Great Britain was inclined to oppose it on account of the slave traffic.

Continuing the effort to find some basis for compromise which would satisfy Mussolini's ambitions and at the same time not do too great violence to the Covenant, the League Council voted on September 6 to establish a conciliation committee consisting of representatives of Britain, France, Spain, Poland, and Turkey. The plan drafted by this commission went even farther than the compromise offered Mussolini at Paris. It provided for a reorganization of the police and gendarmerie by "a mission of foreign specialists,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for similar "reorganization" in the field of finances, justice, public health, and education, and for opportunities to "foreigners" to participate in the economic development of the country. The commission also suggested that England and France make minor territorial adjustments to compensate Ethiopia for land which it might cede to Italy.

Faced with the prospect of sanctions if he should unequivocally reject the League's proposals, Mussolini wavered for the first time. While he rejected the commission's plan as not offering "a minimum basis" for the realization of Italy's aims, the door was left open for further negotiations. The chance of hostilities being averted at this late date is indeed very slim. Il Duce has gone too far along the road which leads to war to find it easy to retrace his steps even if he should so desire. But if the powers remain firm in their determination to apply sanctions, and if the present generation of Ethiopians show half the fighting skill that their fathers displayed at Adowa, Mussolini may find that war gives neither the prestige, the riches, nor the power of which he has dreamed.

Public Enemy No. 64B

The Football Broadcaster

By LEFT WING

"HULLO there you football fans, this is Jerry Morgan your All America football reporter talking. Mighty glad to be with you again at the start of another season through the courtesy of Bubblo the gasoline that walks by itself. And what a rip-roaring hectic smashing crashing football session our great nation enjoyed today, yes sir, get an earful you folks, draw up the old armchair because this has been one grand and glorious afternoon for wearers of the cleats while all over this broad land, believe you me, thousands of frantic fans cheered and thrilled at forward passes blocked punts and long runs for touchdowns.

"First of all you red-blooded Americans who love this great old game and who doesn't just a word about a few of the day's gridiron heroes. Hats off folks to McMurdo of Noter Dame playing a roving center and a gridiron croix de guerre to that rearing raging tackle Catfish Simpson of Indiana, to Mickelwichtz, Bonacossa, and McGillcuddy, the Irishmen who stripped the Leopard in his lair, to Wisniski of Catawba, who ran wild among the Mountaineers of Oklahoma, to Jumbo Murphy of Montezuma, a two-fisted hell-bent buckaroo, to that raw-boned cowboy Goldstein of Utah Aggies . . . hats off folks to these heroes to their courage and vigor and skill and determination. So gather round you red-blooded fans who want the low-down on the upsets that took place upon the flaming gridirons of the country from east to west and north to south gather round and absorb this live football dope coming to you from Jerry Morgan your All America football reporter thanks to the courtesy of Bubblo the gasoline that walks by itself.

"As I predicted to you fans last night the Bisons sounded the keynote of the season by ripping tearing crawling and lunging through Southwestern by a score of . . . by a score of . . . got that score there . . . oh, yes, by a score of 3 to 0. Believe you me fans Head Coach Bozo Devine was more than a little worried about that one. The Bobcats had a hectic afternoon with the Hornets and finally came out on the short end; 43 to 0. Over in western Pennsylvania Iron Man Jim McNulty of West Stroudsburg Tech 165 pounds of brain and brawn ran back a kick-off 26 yards against New Jersey State and helped his side win 59 to 0. That's teamplay you fans that is. And out there in the West where the sun never sets on a football gridiron St. Francis beat up St. Mary . . . wow and is this a score get an earful of this folks, 47 to 7. In the Middle West that phenomenal field general Puds Wurtzheimer of Millsaps kicked five field goals against Tuscaloosa and that's a record . . . well almost a record anyhow remember folks this is coming to you from Jerry Morgan your All American football reporter through the courtesy of Bubblo the gasoline that walks by itself.

"Some more scores folks. The Bengals gobbled up the Lizards . . . 6 to 0. Those Tigers sure are a power to be reckoned with this season believe you me and out there in the Smoky Mountain Conference the Blue Devils of Wissahickon conquered Decatur 88 to 0. What a game that must have been! Yaginski of F. and M. ran rings round T. and L. Final score F. and M. 18, T. and L. 6. The gallant warriors of Oswego turned back the best offerings of Newbury with a wave of off-tackle plays double-wing back formations and forward passes that swamped the lads from beyond the Monongahela 7 to 6. The Seals beat up the Janissaries as I predicted last week and Pop Thompson the Old Fox watched his Silver Cyclones shatter that Gopher jinx in a hectic thrilling session the Skibo crashing through in a desperate rally as the ball arched high over the goal posts in the last minute of play. Believe you me folks that was a game. Some more scores: Texas A. and M. 9, Texas F. of L. 9. Hillsdale 28 Dennison 0. How's that for intersectional flavor you fans huh? The Rams beat the Water Buffalos 64 to 12 and don't forget folks this is coming to you from Jerry Morgan your All American football reporter through the courtesy of Bubblo the gasoline that walks by itself.

"Yes sir you fans this sure was a great football afternoon and out of the sweep and surge, out of the whirl and whistle several stars stand emblazoned with the gridiron croix de guerre. Don't overlook Boots Blackjack of Appalachian who converted a ten-yard loss into a touchdown against Valparaiso or Captain Sebastian Drake the pride of the Big Eight for his sterling line play in the mud and rain at Pittsburgh or Snooks Hogan star at U. of S. whose crashing relentless game and piercing forward passes almost torpedoed the Navy Dreadnaught and here folks, here are one or two late scores, those fiery hotspurs the Bisons beat the Chameleons 14 to 7. At the end of the third quarter,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Erskine 0, Jamestown 0, believe you me folks that was a real gridiron classic and the Panthers came out of their cave to crush the boys from the banks of the Wabash 55 to 6 and what a game that must have been.

"Way down in Dixie folks where the spirit of the Confederacy still flames high on Southern gridirons there was one surprise that stunned the football world this afternoon yes sir the Geneva Alligators in case you don't know tamed the flaming flash of conquest coursing through the veins of the Tennessee Mountaineers by a score of 16 to 5. Why folks that gang of Mountaineers packed more dynamite than a New York traffic cop. Next . . . oh yes . . . no score in the MacKendry-MacPherson game and here's a real upset, Kalamazoo 65, Kingfisher 6. That Kalamazoo team sure does pack a wallop and Coach Gus Schwartz had better look out next week for Dynamite Dave Divine and his boys. Gustavus Adolphus 16, Oshkosh Normal 10. A hectic game that was, and that rip-rending fullback Henry B. (Hardtack) Hudson stormed and swept singlehanded through the U. of H. he'll be All American this year or I miss my guess no score in the Ursinus-West Libery game at the end of the third quarter . . . well folks I see my time is up this is Jerry Morgan your All American football reporter coming to you through the courtesy of Bubblo the gasoline that walks by itself. So until next Saturday folks, until next Saturday then you football fans, Cheerio."

Canada Flirts with Fascism

By JAMES H. GRAY

THAT Canada, under its multimillionaire Premier, Richard B. Bennett, was in June of this year speeding toward a fascist dictatorship is conceded by no one in Canada save a few Communists. True, the leader of the Liberal Party, W. L. MacKenzie King, who is determined to make civil liberties the issue in the national election, has accused Bennett of crimes against the civil and personal rights of the Canadian people, but his followers laugh privately at the idea that Bennett has been trying to establish a dictatorship with himself as the man on horseback.

Yet when all the apparently unrelated minor incidents and outstanding acts of his rule are brought together, the only explanation that makes sense is that Bennett, about to be booted into oblivion by an outraged people, was trying to escape from this fate by the dictatorship route. If the ruthlessness of his actions while Premier is any criterion, it would have been anything but a pleasant experience for those who opposed his will. That he failed, temporarily at least, may be attributed to the patience of the leaders of the great relief-strike army, who refused to allow him to provoke their followers into acts of violence which would have given him an excuse to declare a state of national emergency, prorogue Parliament, and remain in office for another year or two.

Bennett has every characteristic of a dictator. A millionaire many times over, he dug deep into his pocket to finance the Conservative Party's election campaign in 1930, and by employing all the tricks of a mountebank sent his party into power with an overwhelming majority and himself into office as Premier of Canada. Having paid the shot and called the tune, he assumed, with some logic, that the Conservative Party belonged to him. An arrogant egotist, he soon made it plain that he had no more tolerance for criticism, or even advice, from members of his own party than from the opposition.

Bennett's dictatorial ambitions were quickly manifest, although they were not recognized as such at the time, owing, no doubt, to the nature of the campaign he conducted. He was the first politician in the world to guarantee to cure the present depression. During the 1930 elections he loudly lamented the 100,000 unemployed. This situation he promised to remedy in short order. The Canadian voters, who, until Bennett brought it to their attention, had never heard of the depression, were impressed by his calamity howling and indignantly turned the Liberal Party out of office. Having called attention to the plight of the unemployed, Bennett assembled a special session of Parliament to inaugurate a comprehensive system of state relief, for which the jobless have reason to be grateful, pending the recovery that was to result from his high-tariff policy.

But instead of bringing his budget before the house in the traditionally detailed manner, the new Premier merely asked for what is now referred to as his blank-check legislation. He demanded and got authority to spend all the money he wanted in any manner he thought fit, and, far more important, he was authorized to take any steps he considered necessary to preserve law, order, and good government in Canada.

Simultaneously with the passage of the blank-check legislation, the red-hunters were turned loose. Section 98 of the criminal code, which anticipated by sixteen years the vicious anti-labor legislation now being enacted in various parts of the United States, was invoked against the Communist Party; the party was outlawed and eight of its leaders were sent to jail for long prison terms. This amendment to the Canadian criminal code was passed during a twenty-minute session of the Cabinet in June, 1919, when general strikes led by the militant One Big Union were giving the Conservative government of the day no little concern. One of its clauses makes it possible for a person to be arrested as a member of an unlawful association—before the association is declared unlawful—and subject to all the awful penalties of the act if it can be shown that he has attended a single meeting of that association. Not only was this law inoperative under the Liberal government; it was repealed by the House of Commons on six occasions between 1921 and 1930. On each occasion the Conservative-dominated Senate rejected the repeal.

The Communists who went to prison, however, had at least the benefit of a trial by jury, which was more than was granted their fellow-radicals whom Bennett wished to be rid of. For them a wholesale kidnapping was planned. Royal Canadian Mounted Police, acting under the orders of the Immigration Department, were given a list of suspected alien Communists. The procedure was for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mounties to invade the home of one of these workers in the middle of the night, arrest their man, hurry him to the railway station, and place him upon an eastbound train for Halifax. Here he was given a star-chamber hearing before an employee of the Immigration Department and summarily deported, often to certain death in fascist countries. Many of the victims were of British birth, many were dragged out of bed without a moment's notice; in cases where the kidnapping became known to their friends they were spirited out of town and hidden away so that habeas corpus proceedings could not effect their release. How many were victimized by such action will probably never be known.

These three major crimes against the bill of rights brought forth a loud protest in the liberal newspapers, but the transformation of the Mounted Police from a small federal police force into a strong private army did not. Prior to 1930 Canada had three sets of policemen—the municipal, the provincial, and the Royal Canadian Mounted. The Mounties, a federal force under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice, looked after the prevention of smuggling and rum running, the policing of the Northwest territories, and the enforcement of laws against the drug traffic. With unemployment increasing steadily, provincial governments were in desperate straits to balance their budgets. When Bennett made the proposal, therefore, that the provincial police, who patrolled roads, hunted bootleg stills, and did other miscellaneous chores, could be merged with the Mounties, thus removing duplication and saving money, the western provinces fell in with the idea. The Mounted Police was then expanded and assigned to the policing of the provinces. The agreement between the governments said that the force was to be under the control of the Minister of Justice at all times except when the provincial attorneys general had need of it. The result was that Bennett became the owner of a private army of storm troopers which could be sent from one part of the country to another more quickly than the regular army.

Bennett's attitude toward the spectacular box-car trek of 2,000 relief-camp strikers from Vancouver to Regina made clear his dictatorial ambitions. The relief camps were organized in 1932, somewhat in the style of the American CCC camps, to take young, single unemployed men off the streets. But while American CCC youths earn a dollar a day and their keep, the Canadian camp workers were paid twenty cents a day, less deductions. Hundreds of young Canadians now cherish as souvenirs checks for one, two, or three cents which they received in payment for a month's work. And while the men worked for starvation wages they were subjected to a myriad concentration-camp regulations. Even grievance committees were outlawed, and if conditions became too unbearable the men were forced to approach a straw boss individually and complain to him. Individual complainers soon learned the folly of such action; they were expelled from camp and blacklisted, as were labor organizers who attempted to form unions in the camps.

But bad food, unsanitary working conditions, and the hopelessness of their lot combined to force the workers into a union. After several tests of strength 3,000 camp workers went on strike in British Columbia early in April. Declaring that they were through with "slave camps," they marched into Vancouver and demanded work with wages, the right to vote, collective bargaining, compensation for injuries sustained during employment in the camps, and removal of the camps from the jurisdiction of the department of national defense—the military. Though riots ensued and the city was in turmoil, the citizens of Vancouver rallied to their support. The Communists, Socialists, and labor groups organized a united front to support the strikers. But Bennett refused even to consider the demands of the men. Through his acting prime minister, he replied to an urgent request from the Mayor of Vancouver for financial aid to feed the strikers by offering to send sufficient soldiers to run the men out of town, but he refused to grant a dollar for their sustenance.

After two months of buck-passing, the men lost patience with the officials with whom they were dealing and decided to move en masse on Ottawa, 2,500 miles away, to present their case. On June 3 an army of 700 relief strikers boarded a freight train and headed eastward. Under rigid self-discipline, it moved east without interference; indeed, on more than one occasion the police actually held up the train until all were safely aboard. They were enthusiastically welcomed wherever they stopped and recruits from the camps en route enlisted in droves. By the time they reached Regina they were over 2,000 strong. But their movement toward Ottawa was necessarily slow, and while they were going through the Rockies, Bennett's storm troops were being collected in eastern Canada and rushed to Regina to halt the march there. When after a four-day rest in Regina the men announced that they were going to move on, the commander of the 400 storm troops forbade them to entrain. The men, however, were determined to go and over 5,000 Regina citizens went to the railway yards to put them on the train. Then, at the last minute, a wire was received from Ottawa telling the men that two Cabinet ministers were being sent west to negotiate with them and that they should await their arrival in Regina. The men waited; Bennett's straw men arrived, heard their demands, pronounced them reasonable, and suggested that, as they had no power to grant them, the army stay in Regina at government expense and send a delegation of eight to Ottawa to negotiate with the Premier. The offer was accepted.

The halt of the men at Regina precipitated an outburst from the provincial government, which wired Bennett that the Mounted Police were supposed to be under orders from the attorney general and that Bennett had no right to interfere. Bennett, acting through his number one straw man, the Honorable Hugh Guthrie, Minister of Justice, ignored the telegrams of protest and ordered his storm troopers about as he saw fit. The relief-camp strikers had provided him with an opportunity of staving off the election and, if handled rightly, of grasping the dictatorship. To accomplish this he must obviously stand firm, refuse their demands, and try to provoke them into some act of violence which could be construed as a revolutionary uprising.

The delegates arrived at Ottawa, where an attempt was made to stall them off for several days. When this failed, a conference was held that made a mockery of the word negotiate. Bennett, in a manner typically insolent and overbearing, launched into a diatribe against the leaders of the strike, denounced the head of the delegation as a thief, and ended the conference by telling the members to go back to their camps and wait until prosperity returned, when they would be given jobs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The delegation returned to Regina and the trek was on. The men showed their desire to stay within the law by going to the provincial government and getting permission to travel in trucks over the highways to Manitoba. A call for trucks went out, permits were obtained, and a test run started. Bennett, however, ordered his storm troopers to arrest all car or truck drivers who attempted to take the men out of Regina and to confiscate their trucks. The trucks were stopped and the drivers and passengers arrested under Section 98. Called on by Parliament to defend his high-handed tactics, Bennett now conjured up the red terror, and declared that the relief-camp strike was a part of a gigantic world-wide Communist plot to overthrow existing governments by force.

While the delegation was in Ottawa, Bennett broke his promise to the men that no attempt would be made to disrupt the army during the absence of the leaders. He built a concentration camp outside Regina, and offered free transportation home to every striker who would quit the army and enter the camp. He got less than a dozen deserters.

Exasperated as they were by Bennett's lawless tactics, the strikers refused to be provoked. A tight blockade had been thrown around the city, they could neither go ahead nor retreat, and they could not stay in Regina since their food had been cut off. To attempt to run the blockade eastward would undoubtedly have led to bloodshed. The men recognized this and offered to return to Vancouver as they had come—atop a freight train under their own organization. Bennett refused to permit them to leave. Stool pigeons in the ranks sent out word that the men were going to set up their own camp in the country and beg for food pending the declaration of peace. Bennett issued a stern warning that anyone who supplied the men with food or shelter or allowed them the use of land on which to make a camp would be arrested and imprisoned under Section 98.

These men, it should be emphasized, had spent several years in relief camps; they were destitute and had nothing to lose. Yet in the face of tyrannical orders and slow starvation they somehow managed to keep their heads, while they steadfastly refused to enter Bennett's concentration camp. Knowing that to stay on in Regina would ultimately lead to disaster, the leaders went to the provincial government and asked that it take charge and disband the army and send the men back to Vancouver or to their homes. By the afternoon of July 1 arrangements were almost completed. A mass-meeting of about 500 strikers and 2,500 Regina citizens was called for that evening. It was a peaceful meeting, just as all previous mass-meetings had been peaceful. A speaker outlined what steps had been taken and asked for the continued support of the strikers. Suddenly a piercing whistle was heard, and 400 storm troopers and Regina city police, armed with clubs, guns, and tear gas, charged into the crowd of defenseless men, women, and children. One of the bloodiest riots in Canadian history followed: clubs and rocks were used against clubs, guns, and blackjacks; one Regina policeman was killed; more than 40 Regina citizens were injured, and 100 persons were arrested after the riot, which lasted more than four hours.

The police said they had received orders from Ottawa to arrest the strike leaders and thought that that was the best way to get them. Unfortunately for Bennett, Regina's Market Square was alive that night with honest newspapermen who filed eyewitness stories that made it impossible for him to claim the strikers had started the riot. The ensuing uproar against him in the newspapers was impressive, and so was the indignation expressed by the public from one end of the country to the other. Bennett had gambled and lost.

Correspondence

Imperialism and Security

To the Editors of The Nation:

May I venture to dissent from the views of *The Nation* and of my friend Mr. Villard in respect of the Anglo-Italian crisis, as these were expressed in your issue of September 25. In my judgment if the ideas therein expressed are to prevail among liberals and Socialists, both must presently find themselves confronted by precisely the same bankruptcy which overtook them in 1914, at the onset of the World War.

In the contemporary crisis two imperialisms, the British and the Italian, are in shock. The former is sated and therefore on the defensive; the latter is hungry and thus on the offensive. One is seeking to protect an empire created by conquest; the other is striving by conquest to create an empire. Under these circumstances the League of Nations and every other instrument designed to forward collective action to restrain aggression become automatically the weapon of the satisfied imperialism.

What, in effect, liberals and Socialists are now asked to do is to defend an old imperialism against a new. Because the new cannot realize its aims save by war, the old is able to mobilize to its own ends, which have nothing whatever to do with real peace, the thoughtless friends of peace all over the world. And because the present aggression is the work of fascists, there is an additional incentive to liberals and Socialists to join in the effort to restrain Italy.

Nevertheless, there is no more reason that Great Britain should stay in Egypt or the Sudan than that Italy should seize Ethiopia. If you reject the whole thesis of imperialism you cannot, even as a matter of expediency, side with one against the other at any given moment. And if you are opposed to war as a matter of principle, you cannot consistently support war in the present or any similar circumstances.

If in the Ethiopian crisis the British are able to mobilize against Italy the opponents of war in the world and if, as seems likely, to accomplish their ends they also promise to help France in a similar mobilization of world opinion against Germany should she resort to force to change the status quo of Versailles, then the result must be to perpetuate injustice in the name of peace and to make impossible any future adjustments such as can alone prevent eventual conflict.

What is happening today, in my judgment, is what Ponsonby, Cripps, and Morrison of the British Labor Party have somewhat tardily realized. In a word, the British Tory government is exploiting the British peace sentiment to smash the inconvenient undertaking of Italian imperialism. It is ready to risk and even to make war because the recent plebiscite in England provided it with a mandate to use force, if necessary, to restrain any nation guilty of aggression. But its object will not be to serve the cause of peace but that of imperial security.

If, moreover, war results, Italy will presumably be crushed and the repercussions of this war for peace will be felt all over Europe, Asia, and Africa. Once Italy is broken and can no longer play a role in Austria, Germany will certainly move again, and then the same question which arose out of the Ethiopian affair will reappear in an Austrian crisis. And with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

precisely as much justice as in the present case, the friends of peace the world over will be called upon to defend the status quo on the Continent, this time by the French.

In one word, the collective system constitutes a deadly peril for the friends of peace because it inevitably involves them in a series of operations which not merely must end in war but also must compel them to give their approval of war. When Mr. Villard argues that countries should join in sanctions but at the same time stick to the resolution not to resort to hostilities, even in the face of an overt act, he is, in my humble judgment, talking nonsense. If, for example, Britain closed the Suez Canal and Italy retaliated by bombing Malta, does anyone imagine the British would take such an injury lying down?

Every collective action must come either to futility or to war in the face of any nation resolved to modify the status quo at all costs. The status quo of today is, moreover, such, both territorially and economically, that at least three great powers have resolved to achieve revision, even at the cost of war. And Japan has already accomplished this purpose. She did it with impunity, too, because the material interests of other nations did not in their eyes justify resort to war to halt an armed country which could not otherwise be stopped.

The moment liberals and Socialists begin to compromise with principle, the very instant they permit temporary emotions and sympathies to persuade them to adopt a course of expediency, they are lost. Either they are against war or they are for it. Either they believe all wars are bad or they are the assured victims of sated imperialisms which have no other object than to make the League and all of its works the moral façade for their edifices based upon past wars of plunder and aggression. Once the British Tories, for example, saw the British peacemakers committed to the use of sanctions, which inescapably involved war, then they could safely mobilize their fleets and concentrate their troops in the Mediterranean, and the world was again on the edge of a first-class war. Then, all of a sudden, we were back in the atmosphere of 1914 and liberalism and socialism were once more in disarray.

To prevent Italy from indulging in an act of pure aggression against Ethiopia, liberals and Socialists found themselves condemned to approve a British project of coercion conceived as a means of preserving the security of the vital lines of imperial communication running through the Red Sea to India. To me it seems incredible that American liberals should have failed to grasp this truth ultimately or that British Labor leaders should have been slow in discovering the fix into which they have permitted themselves to be maneuvered.

The war to end war proved an utter futility. Does anyone believe a war to prevent war would be less a folly? And does anyone think that if liberalism and socialism allow themselves to be the accessories before the fact of a new war born of conflicting imperialisms, they will find themselves in better stead at its end than after the World War? No one can view fascism, whether Italian or German, with greater distaste than I do. But much as I hate these forms of violence I love peace more and am unwilling to make war upon them to serve the ends of either British or French imperialism.

The collective system means war. More than that, it means a war in which the profits must, if the collective action prove successful, belong to the older imperialisms, which at long last have been able to dispense with aggression because they have achieved satiety. But in such a gallery what place is there for any real liberal, any true Socialist, any sincere friend of peace? Therefore as one who loves peace and hates war I rejoice that—late but not too late perhaps—British Labor has identified the booby trap which the British Tories have prepared for it, and sorrow because *The Nation* and Mr. Villard are still on the side of the Angles and not of the angels.

Snowville, N. H., September 26 FRANK H. SIMONDS

The Alabama Suppression Bill

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

Since publication in *The Nation* of my article Bullets Fell on Alabama, I have learned that although the Alabama legislature has repealed the Street anti-sedition law, the state has a similar anti-sedition law, passed in 1923, that makes violation of it a felony with a maximum penalty of ten years' imprisonment and a fine of $5,000.

Writing about this law, Julian Hall, editor of the Dothan *Eagle,* who challenged the law that was repealed, makes the following comment: "It was and is next to impossible to obtain convictions under this law passed in 1923, and for that reason the Street law was passed making violation a misdemeanor. The coal-and-iron operators of Alabama hatched the idea, and now that the Street bill has been bounced back, the legislature should repeal the act of 1923. It is utterly foreign to the philosophy of a free and democratic people."

In short, it was because convictions were impossible under the first law that the Street bill was passed. But this fact should be borne in mind, by Mr. Hall as well as by liberals generally: convictions are not necessary to discourage militant labor activity; merely arresting workers or their leaders tends to prevent effective organization by them. For this reason the 1923 law should, as Mr. Hall says, be repealed.

Norton, Va., September 19 BRUCE CRAWFORD

Refuge for Jews

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

Ludwig Lewisohn takes exception to the statement by Oswald Garrison Villard in his Russia Aids the Jews that "the significance of this promise of a future Jewish republic can best be understood if one realizes the limitations of Palestine. . . ."

Without any desire to enter into a discussion of the moot point of the capacity of Palestine to absorb the Jews, may we point out that on account of the immigration restrictions and the high cost many thousands of destitute and persecuted Jews in Eastern Europe are and for many years will be unable to emigrate to Palestine? Striking confirmation of the fact that many of these are looking toward the U. S. S. R. for a haven of refuge is furnished by the thousands of Jews in Poland and contiguous countries who have made application to go to the autonomous Jewish territory of Biro-Bidjan since the Soviet government announced a few months ago that non-Russian Jews will be admitted into the territory.

The American Committee for the Settlement of Jews in Biro-Bidjan, the honorary chairman of which is Lord Marley and the chairman the Honorable William W. Cohen, has dedicated itself to the task of helping those European Jews whose hopeless condition makes it imperative for them to leave their present habitation to settle in Biro-Bidjan. We have been given to understand that the Soviet government will shortly announce definite regulations under which this immigration will be systematically carried on. The settlers will be aided in establishing themselves in a territory where their own language—Yiddish—is the official one, where anti-Semitism is prosecuted as a crime, where they will have cultural as well as local autonomy, and where they will be enabled to rebuild their lives as farmers and artisans, free from persecution and harassment.

We welcome inquires from all those who may be interested in this work. Our address is 285 Madison Avenue.

New York, September 16 JOHN LYONS,
Executive Secretary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crisis in the Teachers' Union

The Case for the Union

By ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ

AMERICA'S foremost fighting teacher organization—the Teachers' Union—which won an enviable reputation under the militant and far-visioned leadership of President Henry R. Linville, now lies prostrate and discredited. Torn by internecine wars, the tolerant, democratic liberalism and radicalism of its leaders proved no match for the left-wing tactics of (1) the rank-and-filers, led by Isidore Begun, Communist Party leader; (2) the progressives, headed by Ben Davidson, under the leadership of the Communist Party Opposition; and (3) union-loving sentimentalists—the militant Socialists, led by Charles J. Hendley. Why have the union leaders and several hundred members resigned in disgust from an organization to which they had dedicated their lives? Why have these militant and experienced leaders, who have been in the forefront of almost every important struggle for human betterment, been forced to surrender the organization it took them a lifetime to build?

Readers of *The Nation* know that radical A. F. of L. unions have been rent asunder by factional differences among their members, led by persons who consider their allegiance primarily due to the Communist Party or to the Communist Party Opposition. The political differences that divided these groups were early injected into the daily affairs of the Teachers' Union, so that the major time, energy, and thought of the union had to be devoted not to the educational and economic problems facing the teachers but rather to the conflicting political ideologies of these groups. This was bad enough. But when these groups followed the studied policy of sabotage and of misleading our members—especially the younger and less well-informed ones—then life for the active leaders of the union became intolerable.

The real issue is: Can the Teachers' Union continue to advance the best interests of labor, the teachers, and public education if its efforts are continually interfered with or frustrated by these factional, politically disciplined groups that use left-wing tactics, policies, and ideology, that pursue a policy of calculated and organized misrepresentation and sabotage, and that at public mass-meetings of the union are guilty of conduct which brings the union into disrepute, thus destroying the good-will won through twenty years of militant fighting? The issue is clearly and unequivocally one of tactics and conduct, not one of belief or political affiliation, except in so far as the latter helps to explain the conduct which tended to wreck the union.

The report of a committee of the union headed by Professor John Dewey, made after months of careful investigation, clearly indicates that the issue is not the one of "red-baiting" so cleverly but dishonestly put forward by our left-wing elements to confuse naive radicals and liberals. It is not one of job-holding, since Dr. Linville, the president, has risked the loss of his only source of income in order to carry on the work of the organization. Nor is it one of control, as the New York *Post* so dishonestly stated, since the officers who resigned had been recently elected by an overwhelming majority of the members and have since been repeatedly besieged, even by extreme left-wingers, to continue their leadership. The Dewey report points out that the evidence showed conclusively that the left-wing leaders sought to conceal their political affiliation and objectives by unscrupulous attacks upon the officers as "labor fakers," "traitors," and "red-baiters"; that the unfounded charge of lack of democracy was based not upon any concept of democracy commonly accepted, or upon the provisions of our constitution, but upon the refusal of the officers to follow the "correct line," that is, the Communist line.

Space prevents citing of the record to show the attempts of these groups to tie the union to Communist-dominated affiliates like the so-called A. F. of L. Committee on Unemployment Insurance, and to discredit labor's basic legislation or subordinate it to measures supported by Communists, thus endangering our labor affiliation. Only two votes saved the union from being lined up with the Manufacturers' Association and the Communist Party against labor's unemployment measure—the Byrne-Killgrew bill. In the face of such tactics how could our extremists continue to expect the full support of labor—a support that in the past has made possible many of the outstanding victories of the union?

How easy it is for radicals who may enjoy their labor affiliation in an atmosphere of academic aloofness to say: "Union leaders must bear with obstructionists, and must carry on!" Those who have had their health wrecked by the antics of our left-wingers are not impressed. No human machine can be the victim of such conduct and tactics without collapse. For thirteen years the officers lived in a union hell and carried on in the face of overwhelming odds when others might have retired. During this time the union leaders defended left-wingers whose infantile concept of revolutionary and labor tactics brought them into conflict with the educational authorities. Repeatedly left-wingers exposed themselves to official reprisal by indorsing Communist Party candidates, by issuing factional attacks upon each other, and by other similar methods. The leaders even defended the outstanding rank-and-file leader whom the union had been forced to suspend for a year for his sabotaging, anti-labor, and disruptive tactics. Surely those liberals who live their radicalism and labor affiliation vicariously cannot expect more tolerance and patience than the union leaders displayed for thirteen years.

The tragedy of the union is a fact. The onus for this tragedy must rest squarely upon the following elements: (1) the politically controlled left-wing groups that subordinated the well-being of the union to their concept of primary allegiance to a political party and its tactics; (2) naive but well-intentioned liberals and radicals who acted as "window-dressing" for the left-wingers, enabling them to mislead an uninformed public; (3) the militant Socialists in alliance with reactionaries in our national organ-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ization; (4) union members who believed their full duty performed when they had paid their dues and permitted the over-faithful few to bear the brunt of the battle. It is the hope of the writer that out of this major tragedy the radical intellectual forces of America may learn enough to prevent similar catastrophes.

The Opposition Replies

TO understand how Dr. Lefkowitz and Dr. Linville have come to attack the organizations to which they belonged for years, the Teachers' Union of New York and the American Federation of Teachers, with the demagogic cry that they are at once left-wing and reactionary, and to commit the anti-union crime of setting up a dual organization outside the American Federation of Labor, the dynamics of contending forces within the Teachers' Union must be reviewed. For years individuals who had acquired a reputation for energetic, progressive personal conduct in behalf of teachers were regularly reelected to the administrative posts on the basis of personal prestige. They acted as an aristocracy which alone could perform the functions of the union by quiet lobbying, an occasional press release, personal contacts with officials, and formal protests. The members at large, however, were never given a concrete program of activity; they did not act as organizers. The union stagnated.

With the depression, attacks upon the position of teachers in New York became ever more intense. This situation brought into being several groups of members which insisted that the defense of teachers' interests demanded a new line of action. While they differed with one another in regard to the internal policy of the union, these opposition groups were substantially in agreement upon external policy, that is, methods of presenting the case for public education and the teachers before the public, of reaching governmental agencies, of defending teachers' rights in specific instances, and of enlarging the union. Their program included, among other things, lowering of dues to facilitate increasing membership; organizing all teachers into a single union, with full membership rights at lowered dues for unemployed teachers, substitutes, teachers in training, and so forth; complete democratization of union machinery; active support of progressive social objectives, such as a genuine program of social security, the defense of political prisoners, and active anti-war work; unyielding opposition to educational curtailment and retrenchment, salary reductions, coerced "voluntary" contributions by teachers, and company unionism.

On the basis of this program, the opposition increasingly gained adherents. The administration thereupon sought to curtail democratic rights and to concentrate more power in its own hands, and succeeded in so doing on the strength of its personal prestige and by charging its opponents with obstructionism, character assassination, and communism. Far from defending the teachers' academic freedom against business interests which were engaged in red-baiting for the purpose of discrediting public education, it allowed itself to be led into raising a hysterical red-scare within the union itself in order to defend itself against the inroads which the opposition program was making among its following. It not only misrepresented opposition views but exposed them to suspicion and attack by the authorities. It threw the union into convulsions over expulsion proceedings against a list of its opponents, which the membership refused to sustain. It then abolished membership meetings and set up a Delegate Assembly which it hoped to dominate and whose deliberations it restricted in various ways—by limiting discussion on the report of the executive committee to a half-hour, by controlling the agenda, by arbitrary use of the power of the chair, by points of order and other parliamentary devices.

Professor Niebuhr recently said, "Since I got into these issues this summer I have seen how frequently minority rights were outraged." The administration failed, by postponement and neglect, to effectuate the decisions of this Delegate Assembly on the defense of victimized teachers. Finally, finding that even the Delegate Assembly was increasingly supporting the position presented by the opposition forces, the administration turned upon this body, attacked it in unauthorized statements to the membership, and prepared the basis for a campaign to expel the entire opposition and split the union.

The United Committee to Save the Union was set up to oppose expulsions and splits and to democratize the union apparatus. It consisted not only of the opposition groups but also of various independent forces and former administration supporters, who saw that the dynamics of the struggle within the union had driven the administration to maintaining an autocratic and anti-union policy. In the election of May, 1935, the opposition forces won a combined vote of 42 per cent of the membership in contrast with 5 per cent several years earlier. The administration, apparently aware that it was waging a losing battle within the local, characterized the situation as "intolerable" and had the Executive Board, which was controlled by the administration, invite, without consulting either the Delegate Assembly or the membership, an investigation by a special committee of the American Federation. This was a maneuver in a calculated plan, which it concealed from the membership, the Delegate Assembly, and the Executive Board, to call for a revocation of the charter of the Teachers' Union by the American Federation of Teachers at its Cleveland convention, for the purpose of reorganizing the union with the opposition elements excluded. The United Committee to Save the Union offered proposals for conciliation and compromise to the officers through Dr. Counts and Dr. Niebuhr as mediators. The administration of the union rejected all overtures. Likewise at the Cleveland convention held in August, Dr. Lefkowitz and Dr. Linville stubbornly refused to entertain the compromise proposals of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers. They insisted that they would be satisfied with nothing short of charter revocation. They instigated a telegram from Mr. Green demanding that the convention revoke the charter of Local 5, charging that the New York union was dominated by Communists, and stating that failure to comply with his demand would jeopardize the status of the American Federation of Teachers in the American Federation of Labor. Despite this intimidation, the convention voted to reject the demand for charter revocation. The next day the delegates representing the administration of the Teachers' Union of New York withdrew from the convention. On their return to New York they issued a barrage of attacks in the public press upon the con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vention and the new officers and Executive Council elected by it, designed to discredit both the local and national bodies and prepare a split in the American Federation of Teachers.

We cannot here attempt to answer all the petty charges made by Dr. Lefkowitz against the American Federation of Teachers and Local 5. These have been and will be refuted in the daily press and the columns of liberal periodicals.

Dr. Lefkowitz's "rule or ruin" policy in Local 5, his red-baiting attacks in his own local, his effort to split the American Federation of Teachers, to discredit its duly elected officers, to set up a dual organization, have met with almost universal condemnation. The extent to which Dr. Lefkowitz has been repudiated by the membership is clearly indicated by the following: On three days' notice 1,200 members rallied to a mass-meeting called by the United Committee to pledge their loyalty to Local 5 and the American Federation of Teachers. This constituted a majority of the membership and was much larger than any regular meeting the union had ever held.

UNITED COMMITTEE TO SAVE THE UNION

Two Defeats for William Green

By B. J. WIDICK

Akron, Ohio, September 25

WHEN William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, journeyed West to form in the automobile and rubber industries the 106th and 107th international unions to be affiliated with the A. F. of L., he carried charters granted by the executive council which excluded all craft-union members—there are twenty-two craft unions in automobiles and seven in rubber. He also held mandates giving him power to appoint all officers of the newly created unions; his primary object in this, observers believe, was to build up support for his regime at the coming national convention of the A. F. of L.

At Detroit Green succeeded in appointing his organizer, Francis J. Dillon, as president of the new auto workers' international union over the protests of a good majority of the 275 delegates, and he forced acceptance of the charter by bluntly telling the delegates, "Take this or nothing." He chose the entire executive board of the union—it is not surprising that it includes not one of the leaders who have distinguished themselves in the strikes of the past two years. When the delegates voted 164 to 112 against a resolution approving his appointment of officers, he disregarded it. And not until rank-and-filers succeeded in setting up a committee of seven to carry an appeal to the national convention against his dictatorial methods did he realize that instead of building up support he was only crystallizing opposition.

Least of all did Green foresee the effect of his Detroit acts on the rubber workers, who were gathering in Akron from points as far apart as Los Angeles, California, and Cambridge, Massachusetts, to realize an ambition of two years' standing—the building of an international union. There had been an abortive attempt in 1933; and a convention in 1934 had established the United Rubber Workers' Council, craft-controlled, as governing body in the rubber industry. The story of Green's tactics at the auto workers' convention served to swing the rubber workers' delegates to support the slogan of democracy and gave the progressives control of the convention.

When Green arrived, the progressives, taking the offensive, presented him with a petition signed by forty of the first forty-seven delegates asking for "democratic procedure" and the right to elect all officers. This attack, neatly timed by Thomas Burns, brilliant young ex-organizer for the A. F. of L. from Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, gave the progressives the first break in news; and such headlines as "Progressives Fight for Democracy Against Green Dictatorship" made Green's job extremely difficult. None the less, when he presented the charter excluding craft unionists, he said to protesting delegates, "You can neither accept, nor reject, nor change any of this charter. I confer it on you. That's why you're here!" A fiery fighter for democracy, Salvatore Camelio of Cambridge, Massachusetts, asked Green if this gave him, Green, the right to appoint officers as it did the right to segregate and separate the workers, to which Green, avoiding a direct answer, replied: "I'll study the situation and then decide my course." Camelio had the last word: "We want to elect our officers," he said; "we'll fight for democracy here." The delegates cheered.

Hostility marked the next two days of the convention. The progressives caucused openly for their move to obtain election of officers, ignoring Green completely. The undercurrent of criticism of Green and of Coleman C. Claherty, organizer and A. F. of L. choice for president, became so sharp that delegates under Claherty's thumb brought in a compromise resolution asking Green to appoint Claherty as president and allow election of all other officers. The resolution also carried a provision asking financial aid from the A. F. of L. It was introduced first although it was numbered 21. Green ruled it was in order and proceeded to speak for its adoption. He said to the convention: "Even if you don't pass this resolution, I can still appoint officers. I have a mandate." He threatened withdrawal of A. F. of L. financial support if the resolution was defeated. "It contains a clause," he said, "asking our money and if you defeat it, you'll have to make your own way." Camelio took the floor and criticized Green for "trying to withhold money when that isn't the question now. We want to elect our officers. That's the argument."

Then Green changed his tactics and turned on Burns, the floor leader of the progressives, accusing him of associating with a dual-union movement in the past and of criticizing the A. F. of L. in Akron meetings. He ordered Burns to stand and answer the charges. The meeting was tense; if Green could defeat Burns and ruin him, the spearhead of the progressive bloc would be blunted. But Burns was more than equal to the test. In a brilliant and daring move Burns brought out by questioning Green that Green himself had appointed a dual unionist, F. L. Phillips, to a high post. Burns flatly denied speaking against the A. F.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of L. Sherman H. Dalrymple, an outstanding Akron labor leader, president of the Goodrich local and now president of the rubber workers' international, rose to Burns's defense, branding Green's charges as false and making an eloquent plea for democracy. Other speakers kept the session in turmoil as Green retreated. The roll-call vote defeated the resolution, forty-four to nine, an overwhelming blow to Green and a repudiation of Claherty. Green left the room in a fury.

One last move was made by Claherty to regain control of the convention. He ruled that the resolution asking the A. F. of L. for financial help was out of order unless Resolution 21—his "death warrant" was voted on again. As Claherty's supporters had told the delegates after Green left that they were without financial support, dismay was evident everywhere. Camelio saved the day. "If we do that," he shouted, "Green will be here in five minutes and take control from us. Don't do anything." The question was left undecided.

The election was a landslide for the progressive slate. Dalrymple, a sturdy, level-headed tire builder, became president. Burns received a tremendous ovation when chosen as vice-president. Frank Grillo of Los Angeles, a fairly young militant unionist, was made secretary-treasurer. Five of the six executive posts were won by the progressives—N. H. Eagle of the Mohawk local, long an opponent of Claherty and his policies and easily the most progressive delegate, receiving the highest vote. To add to Green's defeat, one of Akron's powerful unions, the Typographical Union, passed a resolution sharply condemning Green and Claherty and requesting their national officers to fight in the executive council for financial aid to the new union, which will be known as the United Rubber Workers of America.

How was it possible for the rubber workers, whose unions have declined in strength from tens of thousands to a few thousand and who are largely inexperienced in the labor movement, to defeat old-time strategists like Green and Claherty? A left-winger, member of the Workers' Party, who appears to be in very close touch with the rubber workers, explained it: "Two years of defeat under Claherty, two years of bitter experience with the antiquated leadership, constant education from the so-called left-wingers, and the fundamental and natural growth of leadership from the ranks of the workers are reasons that must be borne in mind." Do the rubber workers realize the significance of their victory over Green? Listen to Eagle of the Mohawk local: "We are opening a new era for organization in the basic industries. We have created another dent in the craft-union base of the A. F. of L." Can immediate results be expected? Dalrymple told the delegates: "Already I've received ten phone calls from former members who said they'd be with us until death, now that we have autonomy." The organization of workers in the rubber industry, hitherto a stronghold of the open shop, seems probable.

The progressiveness of the rubber workers who outmaneuvered and outvoted the Green machine can perhaps be best judged by the auxiliary work they accomplished during the one-week convention. They forced into the wastebasket a Claherty-sponsored resolution in the constitution that "members of a Communist Party, I. W. W., or other dual-policy organization be expelled." They secured the adoption of a preamble recognizing the existence of the class struggle and the necessity of replacing capitalism. German fascism and Italian fascist aggression in Ethiopia were strongly condemned, and a boycott was pledged against the two countries.

The Higher History

By HEYWOOD BROUN

CHARLES ANGOFF, in the current issue of the *American Spectator,* mentions me in a piece and says that even Broun's best friends are often embarrassed by his ignorance of history and literature. Now, this is an accurate and discerning criticism, and my only apology can be that the little I learned of history in school seems now highly inaccurate. If I had learned more I'd be even farther from the facts as they are being disseminated by our leading publicists and politicians.

For instance, take the case of Thomas Jefferson. I'm sure Miss Calhoun in the seventh grade and Miss Hotchkiss in the eighth mentioned that name to me from time to time, and I have a hazy recollection of the character which they assigned to him. But they were all wrong. I learn now from the speeches of Herbert Hoover and others that Thomas Jefferson was the founder of the Republican Party and that he enunciated a doctrine called "state's rights" which has always been the priceless heritage of the G. O. P.

And then, in the writings of William Randolph Hearst I find it pointed out that Thomas Jefferson was a man who devoted his lifetime to fighting an increase in the income-tax rates in the higher brackets. Jefferson, if I am to believe these later scholars, was insistent that the reds should be driven out of every college and schoolhouse in the country. He was, it seems, the man around whose philosophy Mr. Hearst has patterned his editorial policy.

In kidnapping Jefferson the Republicans seem to have abandoned one of the most famous of the founding fathers. I'm quite sure that in school we heard the name of Hamilton in connection with the Constitution of the United States. Jefferson was across the water and the Atlantic was somewhat broader in those days. But now neither Hearst nor the Republicans have very much to say about Hamilton because he seems to have thrown his weight behind the theory of a highly centralized government. It is true, to be sure, that Republican spokesmen want a strong federal government in such matters as subsidies and other privileges. It is only when the rights of labor are involved that the cry is raised, " 'Each man for himself!' Back to Jefferson."

I don't know exactly when Jefferson said that. We didn't get it in my course in American history. The economics of William Randolph Hearst are also puzzling to an indifferent scholar who may have missed much of the shrewd theorizing of our famous ancestors. As far as I can make out, the heart of Hearst bleeds for the toiling masses, particularly for those millions who are unemployed. He wishes they would get well—or something.

In Horace Mann, back in 1906, George Washington was pictured to us as a man of resolute character and as a military and political leader who gained his ends by his tenacity. But nobody ever told us that George Washington

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was so profound a student of international affairs that his slightest word concerning foreign entanglements should govern our State Department to the end of time.

In our day there weren't any Communists, and I never heard either Miss Hotchkiss or Miss Calhoun called a red or an alien agitator. And yet I distinctly recollect that we were taught that the great men of America were fallible human beings, that they were not beyond the influence of their social and economic background, and that their decisions were often governed by the immediate local situation. In this very point it seems now my education was deficient.

I gather from the leaders in the Hearst papers that all the founding fathers were giants in stature and in intellect. They spoke, and wrote, and thought under divine inspiration. They foresaw the coming of the aeroplane and the railroad, and established the organic law of the nation accordingly. Anybody who attempts to pick a single flaw in the men of the Constitutional Convention must be the paid agent of Moscow. As a matter of fact, we did have one course not unlike that which is included in the higher learning dispensed by Hearst. Only we didn't call it American history. It was called mythology.

Some of the most conservative people in this country are urging now the teaching of the American Constitution as a mandatory subject in all schools. But they don't say just which kind of constitutional history they mean to teach, and in all fairness it ought to be said that those who speak from the left are possibly equally dogmatic in insisting upon a certain philosophic concept of past events.

Now, it is entirely possible that there is no such thing as utterly scientific history. Human conduct will not fit into the neat categories of the chemist or the physicist. But without wishing to straddle, I wonder whether the preliminary courses, at any rate, might not be governed more by consideration of the incidents involved than by the economic interpretation. The great historian, of course, is no mere reporter. After all, even in the selection of facts he must betray his own particular point of view. He cannot be content to set down "what" and stop at that. He will, if he is a scholar, reach out for the eternal "why."

Still there is something to be said for a detached sort of liberalism in the schooling of the very young. My radical friends assure me that sooner or later each of us must make his choice between communism and fascism. But I still deny that each little boy or girl born alive must be from the very beginning a revolutionary or a reactionary.

At the moment the flaws in the teaching of history lie with the conservatives. The radicals haven't had any actual chance at indoctrination in spite of the loud outcries of Mr. Hearst. A teacher, like a historian, can hardly be an entirely neutral person. The man or woman in the classroom gives out much of himself. It is silly to talk against indoctrination without admitting that it has been going on for a great many years in our schools, and it has been, up to now, 99½ per cent an indoctrination toward the right.

If I had my life to live over again I would gladly study more history, but I would also ask the historians to live their lives over again. I cannot think of a single accepted author who has approached the chronicle of our nation wholly in the humble spirit of the inquiring scientist.

A 3-Way Guide: TELLS, SHOWS, EXPLAINS:

SEX PRACTICE *in* MARRIAGE

By C. B. S. Evans, M.D., F.A.M.A., Member White House Conference, Committee on Maternal Care, Washington—Introduction by R. W. Holmes, M.D., F.A.C.S., Professor of Obstetrics, Northwestern University Medical School—Prefatory and other notes by Norman Haire, Ch.M., M.B., Specializing Obstetrician, Gynecologist and Sexologist, London, England

— and —

CHARTS OF SEX ORGANS WITH DETAILED EXPLANATIONS

By Robert L. Dickinson, M.D., F.A.C.S., Senior Gynecologist and Obstetrician, Brooklyn Hospital

CONTENTS

Section I. Bride and Groom
Section II. The Cold Wife—Frigidity
Section III. The Unsatisfied Wife
Section IV. Married Courtship
Section V. The Perfect Physical Expression of Love
Section VI. Illustrative Charts and Explanations

THE CHARTS

Female Sex Organs, Side View • The Internal Sex Organs • The External Sex Organs • Female Sex Organs, Front View • Entrance to Female Genital Parts • Male Sex Organs, Side View • Male Sex Organs, Front View • Male Reproductive Cell, Front and Side Views. (*Detailed explanations accompany charts.*)

"From a very large clinical experience I have come to the conclusion that probably not one in five men knows how to perform the sexual act correctly. As a general thing, even in so-called normal coitus, the man considers only himself and not the woman at all."

COMMENTS

"This book is one of the clearest and most sensible expositions of the *ars amandi*. . . . The importance of the wife's reaching an orgasm and the technique of insuring that result are emphasized."
—*Quarterly Review of Biology*

"Begins with a description of the nervousness of the young bride on the first night of marriage, and ends with an account of the positions in which coitus may take place."
—*Lancet* (leading English medical journal)

"Tells the ordinary man and woman what they want to know, simply and directly. I should like to compel everyone—particularly men—to read it (they'd give women a straighter deal if they did)."
—Ethel Mannin in the *New Leader*

"Deals with the physical and psychological problems of coitus. . . . Can be freely recommended to patients who require guidance in their marital life. . . . It would certainly help men to understand the 'frigid wife'."
—*General Practice*

"The frank, yet delicate, handling of the subject makes the manual one that a physician may safely suggest."
—*American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*

"Evans gives all the advice that anybody needs."
—*Journal of the American Medical Association**

* The membership of the American Medical Association consists of approximately 100,000 physicians.

Only $1.95 (Postage 15c extra) **EMERSON BOOKS**, Dept. 102-N, **333 Sixth Ave., N. Y. C.**

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Drama

Poet's Quest

Eugene O'Neill: A Poet's Quest. By Richard Dana Skinner. Longmans, Green and Company. $2.

WHEN Eugene O'Neill produced his latest play, "Days Without End," Roman Catholic critics were not unnaturally inclined to accept it as a literal confession of faith and to hail with enthusiasm what they regarded as a sign of its author's conversion. Now Mr. Skinner, formerly dramatic critic of the *Commonweal,* has proceeded to analyze the entire body of O'Neill's work in the light of this assumption and has produced an interesting little study in which the dramatist's development is likened to that of the saint who passes through his periods of despair, suffers regressions from those states of peace which he is able to achieve, and finally wins through to faith.

Obviously such a scheme of treatment is based upon the assumption that "Days Without End" foreshadows the whole future course of the author's development. Personally, I have some reason to doubt that the assumption is justified, and I must also say that one of the weaknesses of Mr. Skinner's method seems to me to be revealed in the fact that it tends inevitably to push into the foreground plays like "Days Without End" and "The Straw," which are relatively unimportant from the dramatic standpoint, while treating "Desire Under the Elms," "Strange Interlude," and "Mourning Becomes Electra" under the general head "Regression." But whatever may be said against the treatment, at least this important virtue must be granted it: the problems and the conflicts central to O'Neill's dramatic work are problems and conflicts to the analysis of which Mr. Skinner's categories and points of reference are very decidedly relevant.

O'Neill, as he points out, is essentially a moralist and a mystic. As O'Neill himself, speaking in figurative language, has said, his interest is in "the relation between man and God" rather than in that between man and man, or man and society. The local habitation which he gives to his characters is usually of only very secondary importance. The essential thing is not the way in which the manners of one time or place differ from those of another but the fact that two phenomena—the conflict between good and evil and man's desire to feel himself in harmony with something outside himself—eternally reappear. Most of his important characters are obsessed with the two ideas—the sense of sin and the sense that they either do or do not, in the word of the Hairy Ape, "belong." It is this fact more than anything else which explains why to some O'Neill seems so obviously the most considerable of our dramatic writers while to others, with nothing of the moralist or the mystic in them, he seems only irritatingly irrelevant to those discussions of the relation of man to man which seem to them the only significant ones. It is because of this fact also that, although one can dismiss O'Neill in various ways, one cannot actually come to grips with his problems except in terms something like those which Mr. Skinner uses.

Whether or not one believes precisely those terms to be the best must depend in the end upon one's attitude toward the church and its claims. If one assumes that the Catholic formulation of the problems and its solution of them is correct and final, then of course they impose themselves and must be applied to the measurement of any man's work. But if, on the contrary, one assumes that they represent only one of the attempts to formulate and solve problems more universal even than Catholic theology, then one may assume not only that its terms are not necessarily the most appropriate to O'Neill, but also that his own most significant treatments of his themes have been those in which he seemed to be formulating and either solving or failing to solve problems in a highly original way, rather than that single play where he seemed to bring himself at last to the acceptance of a ready-made solution many times previously rejected.

If it be taken for granted that a Catholic would naturally find the orthodox solution the most significant possible one, it may be taken no less for granted that a non-Catholic would dissent; but if my dissent is forgone I should at least like to assign a local reason for it and to rest my case on the simple contention that a critical approach cannot be the very best one if it leads to the conclusion that "Days Without End" must rank above "Mourning Becomes Electra."

To me the latter play is not only one of the best but also, among all the others, that which most clearly reveals the central effort and the central accomplishment of the author. His determination to retell in modern terms a great tale of the past, far from being the result of a mere desire to perform a stunt, was dictated by a wise desire to compare in this way the spiritual resources of two civilizations. We know what this particular series of events was made by the Greeks to yield. If we can discover the most that the same events can be made to produce in the atmosphere of our own civilization, then we shall have a comparative measure of its resources; and just in so far as we approach the richness and dignity of the Greek story, just in so far do we prove our culture capable of approaching theirs in the richness of its possible emotional life.

The story of Clytemnestra, Orestes, and the rest could, of course, be told in terms of tabloid journalism. Doubtless it has been told many times by police reporters, and we are sometimes inclined to assume that the terms of such a police reporter are the ones to which it has inevitably been reduced by the rationalizing tendency of modern thought. But O'Neill is moved by the conviction that this debasement of a story of passion and crime to the police-court level is not inevitable, that there remain to us depths and dignities which could lift the story into another realm if they were properly exploited. And "Mourning Becomes Electra" is precisely the effort to exploit them. It does not rest upon Greek convictions or upon Catholic ones. For the purposes of the play, at least, it assumes that both are lost as possible sources for either a sense of the weightiness of human actions or a sense of "belonging" to something. On the contrary the play attempts, by the sheer intensity with which it presents strength of character and high passion, to make these things seem sufficient in themselves to demonstrate that the possibility of emotional greatness has not departed from us. It is, in effect, the tragic poet's answer to the charge that both the sense of sin and the sense of greatness have disappeared from the human consciousness along with the religious sanctions which supported them.

Perhaps the distance between Sophocles and O'Neill is some sort of measure of the extent to which the weakening of the sanctions has weakened the emotions which they strengthened if they did not create; but the distance is not as immeasurably great as it may have sometimes seemed when we were in the presence of tale-tellers who accepted too easily the police-court view of human nature, and that is the measure of the play's importance. In such a work the author's affirmation is, of course, less definitely formulated than in "Days Without End." He lacked the words which a theology supplies to name his mystic and moral convictions. But this very stopping short of a word which would specify too closely to win the assent of many is perhaps rather a strength than a weakness. Because of it "Mourning Becomes Electra" is more "universal" than "Days Without End."

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Milestone in Popular Education

War Tomorrow—Will We Keep Out? Headline Books No. 1. Edited by Ryllis Alexander Goslin. Foreign Policy Association. 35 cents.

THE publication of the first of the Foreign Policy Association's new series of popular booklets could hardly be more timely. Faced by the danger that the Italo-Ethiopian conflict may spread throughout the entire world, Americans everywhere are anxiously asking whether it will be possible for the United States to stay out of war. To the extent to which the pressure of an enlightened opinion may be useful in preserving peace, the question boils down to the possibility of finding some technique for counteracting the propaganda of Hearst and the reactionary press among the rank and file of the population. Heretofore the activities of the peace movement have been of two types, neither of which has been adequate to offset the skilful campaign of the jingoist elements. Most of the material sent out by the various peace organizations has been of a propaganda nature, dwelling on the horrors of modern warfare and giving little consideration to its underlying causes. In addition, there has been a small amount of thorough research work—such as that carried on by the Foreign Policy Association—which has been presented in a form suitable only for persons who possess a broad background in world affairs. The great majority of the working class and millions in the middle class—club women, high-school students, the bulk of the readers of our newspapers and popular magazines—have had no way of obtaining accurate and assimilable information on the most important problem before America today.

Too high praise can scarcely be given for the technique employed in "War Tomorrow" for reaching these latter groups. The style is vivid, lucid, and simple—so simple in fact that it could readily be used in the elementary schools. The appeal is enhanced by the liberal use of Neurath symbols for presenting factual material. Beautifully printed, the booklet should appeal not only to persons who have neither the time nor the inclination to read books but also to those who would ordinarily scorn a pamphlet.

In contrast to most attempts at popularization, simplicity has been achieved without sacrifice of accuracy or perspective. While the book appears to lay undue stress on the last war and to be too little concerned with means for preventing the next one, its analysis is intelligent and reasonably well balanced. It places the chief emphasis very properly on the economic causes of war, though it ignores two of the most important of these factors—the growth of economic nationalism, and pressure of surpluses arising out of the maldistribution of wealth. The racial, political, and psychological forces making for war are given relatively meager consideration, but the interrelation of the various factors is brilliantly portrayed. Greater realism would be obtained in the concluding section if less stress were placed on the revision of our neutrality laws and greater attention given to the problem of sanctions.

The fact that one might prefer a shift of emphasis does not, however, detract from the significance of the book as an experiment in popular education. If democracy is to be made even reasonably workable in this complex age, an effective antidote to demogoguery will have to be worked out. The Headline Books are the most promising attempt in this direction yet made, and it is to be hoped that their cost will not stand in the way of the mass distribution which they deserve.

MAXWELL S. STEWART

Revolutionary Fiction

Mr. Aristotle. By Ignazio Silone. Robert M. McBride and Company. $2.

THERE is a wholesome lesson in observing how easily great revolutionary literature cuts through nine-tenths of the critical chatter about "proletarian novels," "communism and art," and the rest of it. I do not mean that such critical discussion is, or need be, a worthless pursuit. But the truth is that during its recent vogue the discussion has been conducted on an intellectual level far below that of great literature and, consequently, below that of a criticism fitted to deal with great literature. There is something naive and crude in the long arguments about whether propaganda is compatible with art, whether individual heroes are permissible in a proletarian novel, whether a proletarian writer must be a communist. Distinctions have been drawn with a mechanistic simplicity irrelevant to the kind of thing—the organized whole—that a good novel is.

No further proof of this is needed than to read, for example, Malraux's "Man's Fate" or Silone's "Fontamara"—the two finest revolutionary novels that I know. In both we find a revolutionary view of the world and of men so integrally fused into the structure of the novels that the primitive antagonisms and oppositions—propaganda versus art, class versus individuals, and so on—do not even raise problems. Nor do these writers, as is the habit of our young Americans, find it necessary to protest their Marxian orthodoxy through their characters and their side remarks; they have the assured confidence of the genuine artist in their own integrity.

I had hoped that Silone's next book would be another novel, a longer novel than "Fontamara," extending and deepening the technique which made that first remarkable and terrible book. "Mr. Aristotle" is, however, a group of five short stories. They give what might be called the elements of what went into "Fontamara."

The short story is an inadequate art form, not being able to compensate by the intensity of verse for its inability to expand as a novel. For this reason, short stories which try to be "complete"— try, that is, to be something other than sketches or studies or reflections of a single mood or feeling—almost always resort to technical tricks to hold together the scaffolding. This is true of the first three stories in "Mr. Aristotle," especially of The Trap, the plot of which is built on a conventional movie type of coincidence. But even in these the trick is so minor a factor in the entire effect as to be easily dismissed. The last two stories are entirely successful, and successful strictly as short stories, complete in themselves.

Silone writes here, as in "Fontamara," almost exclusively about Italian peasants and farm laborers. In terms of their lives, concretely and impersonally, the tortured actuality of contemporary Italy is given. There is no sentimentalization whatever, no attempt to excite a false admiration for the noble peasant-hero or false pity for the sacrificial peasant-victim. His treatment of his peasants, without being mere localized naturalistic descriptions of individuals, reveals them simply as they are: stupid, often brutal, ignorant of the meaning of their lives, chained in the mesh of their prejudices, coarsely humorous. And being what they are, they are also something more than this: their prejudices are being smashed by the social conflicts of modern Italy, the shell of their traditions is being cracked open, and the peasants themselves, without consciousness or guidance, are in a surging, blind motion. The motion is without direction, returning on itself, beaten back from whatever direction it takes by the social forces it does not understand and therefore cannot cope with. Fascism—seldom explicitly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

referred to, and then only in passing—marking the extreme heightening of the conflicts of modern society, becomes a corrosive acid, destroying with its deadly touch all of the old life of the people; but in this destruction, with the vast misery it brings to the peasantry, is the preparation for the new metal that is to be forged. What is destroyed is also the bond that paralyzes the actions of the masses. With the old forms of life eaten away, the choice is annihilation or the new life. Thus in Silone suffering and misery, in their final implications, are never sterile. They are the birth pangs of history. His peasants in their blind movement are waiting and preparing—waiting for consciousness, for leadership; even demanding leadership, as in the story Simplicio, where, having no other guidance in their struggle against the well-to-do of New Town, they turn an old mildly anarchic carpenter into their leader by the projection of their own unformed hates and wishes and hopes.

To write about Silone's work in terms of "social implications" is necessarily misleading. It does grave injustice to his complete rejection of didacticism, to his satire and rich humor, and to his resolute insistence on communicating entirely through the concrete means of his narrative and his characters. But this is only to make clear that, in him, revolutionary passion and understanding are one with the artist.

JAMES BURNHAM

The Holy Blisful Martir

Murder in the Cathedral. By T. S. Eliot. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $1.25.

IT is only in a minor sense that the action of Mr. Eliot's play can be understood as taking place at Canterbury. The stage directions put it there; the chorus is composed of women from the town; the Archbishop stands and talks in his own hall, and at the end is murdered by four English knights while he prays before the cathedral altar; and the date, 1170, is displayed with sufficient prominence. But the peculiar merit of the poem has little to do with all this. It has rather to do with the fact that Mr. Eliot has confined himself with a strict and icy purity to the one aspect of the story which he was equipped to treat. This aspect is such as not even to suggest a comparison with Shakespeare, whose kind of humanity Mr. Eliot nowhere attempts. It suggests only Mr. Eliot, who achieves perfection here to the degree that he explores his own mind and employs his own art.

He is concerned first and last with the morality, or perhaps it is the theology, of martyrdom. Chaucer's "holy blisful martir" is so far from blissful in these pages as to strike a kind of silent terror in the spectator's heart through the spectacle of his bleak and puzzled loneliness. And as for his holiness—ah, that is a question which Mr. Eliot is unable to answer. Indeed the impossibility of answering it is the theme of the play. For who can say that Thomas Becket was without spiritual pride when he determined to obey his instinct of martyrdom? Who can say that he exposed himself to the swords for any better reason than a certain tempter gave him—this tempter being the last of four, and the most deadly of them because he urges "the right deed," namely martyrdom, for "the wrong reason," namely glory? The point is plainly made that if Thomas suffered death for the sake of power and glory he was not holy; and there is abundant evidence, both before and after the catastrophe at the altar, that most of England felt a fanaticism in his final act. But the point is as plainly made that this particular martyrdom may have been designed in heaven, where "the Saints are most high, having made themselves most low." As for an earthly solution to the problem, there is and can be none; nor can Thomas's own words to himself be taken as testimony, since he dies a man and not a saint, and speaks accordingly—as one, that is to say, who desires to know rather than knows.

"Murder in the Cathedral" has been compared with "Saint Joan," but it is both higher and thinner than that; higher because it rises above the merely political problem of obedience to authority, and thinner because theology must always be thin on any stage, even the stage to which Mr. Eliot adapts himself with such dignity, simplicity, and skill. Within its limits the play is a masterpiece, a thing of crystal whose appearance of flawlessness is not altered by the weird reality of the four speeches in prose delivered by the murderers after their job is done. For the irony which tinkles through those speeches is merely the accompaniment of an irony pervading the whole, and reaching its deepest tones in the last words of Becket. Mr. Eliot has written no better poem than this, and none which seems simpler. It is of course not simple; but that is another of its ironies.

MARK VAN DOREN

Two Proletarian Novels

The Green Corn Rebellion. By William Cunningham. The Vanguard Press. $2.

Horse-Shoe Bottoms. By Tom Tippet. Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

TO be thoroughly convincing, a proletarian novel needs more than a social thesis or a sincere belief in one; it needs some of the two-fisted vitality, the hard integrity of the material with which it deals. But this is merely another way of saying that it must be the work of an artist. Mr. Cunningham's novel is such a work—written in a lean, dynamic style that reflects the tenseness of its situations and echoes the natural rhythm of human speech. Mr. Tippet's novel, on the other hand, is a slow-moving narrative which, for all the author's earnestness, fails to realize the naked vigor, the great possibilities for drama contained in its theme.

"The Green Corn Rebellion" is concerned with a small group of poor farmers who in the early days of the war planned to march on Washington and overthrow the government. The heroic but naive little movement never got to first base: physically the men were outnumbered by their patriotic and more resourceful fellow-citizens; psychologically their purpose was overwhelmed in the wave of war-time hysteria that was sweeping the country. So much for the book's major issue; there is a minor issue that serves at all times to sharpen rather than confuse it. Jim Tetlow, a farmer who joins the rebellion, has a wife who is expecting a baby. Drudgery and the bleakness of farm life have prematurely aged her; and Jim finds himself, against his will, being drawn into an affair with her more attractive sister, Happy. Happy becomes pregnant, but she suspects one of the town boys of being the father of her child; she writes to him but he refuses to see her. Seeing no way out of the tragedy, she kills herself. The social and domestic issues of the book reach a common culmination at the end when Jim's patriotic brother, Ted, offers him his choice of enlisting or of having the town inform his father-in-law—one of the leaders of the rebellion—that he is responsible for Happy's death. Rather than hurt the old man, who is on his way to Leavenworth, Jim enlists: overnight he becomes a hero, but he feels like a traitor.

Vital and convincing as these situations are, they are not developed to their full extent in the minds and emotions of the characters—a fault that detracts to some degree from their tragic importance. This, it seems to me, is a valid objection; yet it is to Mr. Cunningham's credit that it does not affect our judgment of his book as a whole. "The Green Corn Rebellion"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

falls easily into the best class of proletarian fiction. It is excellently constructed; the characters are consistently if lightly drawn; the hopelessness of their lives is conveyed in a few strokes but with vigor and precision.

"Horse-Shoe Bottoms" deals with the long, hard fight of a small group of miners to establish a union of their own. Dramatic as such a theme essentially is, the flatness of Mr. Tippet's style and the unimaginative quality of his treatment do it little justice. The characters are types patterned after the most obvious of literary conventions. John Stafford, the hero, is noble, fearless, and true; he utters a few damns when things get too much for him, but aside from these pardonable lapses from virtue he is everything that we should expect of an adult Frank Merriwell. Mr. Tippet has an enlightened sense of social right and wrong, but so far as character portrayal and situation sense are concerned, he is still in the grip of Victorian values. Yet sentimental and banal as his book is, it never becomes cheap or offensive. It even has a certain dignity—no doubt because Mr. Tippet himself is in such deadly earnest.

HELEN NEVILLE

American English

A Dictionary of Modern American Usage. By H. W. Horwill. Oxford University Press. $3.25.

MR. HORWILL, a veteran English journalist who for many years has been writing on English topics for American papers and on American topics for English papers, has had abundant opportunity and a compelling private incentive to study the numerous variations between the English language of the United States and that of Great Britain. For more than thirty years he has thumbed dictionaries and made notes of his personal discoveries.

Several glossaries of current Americanisms have already been compiled for the use of Englishmen and foreigners, but Mr. Horwill has broken new ground. Excluding from his view all indubitable slang and words of purely American coinage or adoption, he has centered his attention on words that are common to the vocabularies of both British and American English, but which in America have developed a somewhat different configuration of their "areas of meaning." Such words are obviously the potential trouble-makers, for they look familiar but are not. The peculiar American uses of these words Mr. Horwill discusses sometimes at considerable length, illustrating them by copious quotations from books and newspapers. The terms "politician" and "politics," to choose a conspicuous example, receive over two pages of explanation and exemplification. A full page is needed to clear up the difficulties lurking in the word "visit." Numerous other words receive as much attention, but most of the articles are, of course, considerably shorter. The work is addressed primarily to Englishmen who need assistance in reading American books, conversing with their American friends, or comprehending American "talkies," but its cisatlantic usefulness is far from small.

Mr. Horwill, having done so much, should not be reproached for his failure to do more. Despite his six years' residence in the country and his remarkably wide reading in American books, however, he does not have an inerrant feeling for American idiom or a perfect knowledge of all things American. The book is flecked with minor errors. He has only a vague notion of what a club sandwich is made of; he is equally hazy on the subject of bob veal, and he is positively wrong about blind baggage. "Truck," in the sense of "garden produce," has developed a noun of agent, "trucker," and a verbal noun, "trucking," but it has not yet become a verb. Here it is his terminology rather than his observation that is at fault. He also makes some strange generalizations. It is not true that in America "Gentile" usually means a "non-Mormon," or that "vet" is used as a colloquial abbreviation for "veterinary surgeon" in England but for "veteran" in America. The "vet"—everywhere in the United States—may be an old soldier, an ex-soldier, or a horse doctor. Wherever the language possesses two established words or phrases of equivalent meaning, it is rash to assert that one of them is exclusively English and the other exclusively American. In most instances both are in regular use in America.

Finally, to make an end of the strictures on a work that I have enjoyed and profited by, Mr. Horwill makes little effort to discriminate the various levels of usage in American English. He is well aware of certain regional variations; it is the social stratification of our linguistic habits that he fails to consider. So far as Americans themselves are aware of any standard of usage, it is an educational standard: good American English is the English of Americans who have attained a certain degree of taste and skill in their use of language. But who are these educated Americans that set the standard? It is a tough question. Mr. Horwill, trying to draw the line between slang and accepted usage, decided that "words used in serious treatises by university professors" should be considered as acceptable. Little does Mr. Horwill know our university professors. That decision opened the door to a whole Noah's ark of uncouth, strange-smelling linguistic beasts. No doubt such curiosities need to be glossed for the benefit of foreign readers, but their actual status ought to be indicated. A professor of history in an American university may write, "He appreciated that the existing laws . . . were working an economic injustice," and the Honorable J. M. Beck may commit the same solecism; it is still a solecism. Theodore Roosevelt and John Hay might write "derelict" as if it meant "delinquent"; their aberration has not established the usage. Mr. and Mrs. Beard, even with the cooperation of other historians, cannot make good American English out of "illy." Printed and published slovenliness is not good American English. Newspaper headlines, which are sometimes made deliberately fantastic, and excerpts from advertisements, also, should not be treated as examples of standard American English.

For American readers, however, these errors and shortcomings are of little moment, detracting nothing from the interest and little from the value of the work. Until recently Englishmen have been inclined to regard American English as a jest or a misdemeanor and in either case as beneath serious consideration. The publication of this book points to a wholesome change of sentiment.

GEORGE GENZMER

Shorter Notices

Cicero. The Fall of a Republic. By G. C. Richards. Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.

It is easy to overwork the parallels of history and particularly fallacious to assume that because Rome succumbed to dictatorship we also must perish; yet just as Lenin evolved his technique for revolution from a study of the failures of the French Revolution, so, Mr. Richards plainly hopes, we may evolve means of saving our democracy from a study of Rome's failure to do so. The two protagonists of the death struggle of the republic, Caesar and Cicero, so greatly surpassed all their contemporaries that they alone were able to understand each other and were constantly drawn to each other in spite of their fundamental differences. Cicero was a wit, orator, bon viveur, statesman, philosopher, an incomparable master of prose, the most completely civilized man of his day. Yet it was unfortunate that in one of the many crises which befell

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Roman republic he should have been its chief defender, for Caesar was his superior as a tactician and in singleness of aim. Cicero wished to preserve the republic, but he also wished to preserve many of the glaring inequities that were undermining it. He had no comprehensive scheme of social change to oppose to Caesar's demagogic appeals, and Mr. Richards's attempt to vindicate his character from the aspersions of Mommsen and Froude, now generally regarded as baseless by scholars, leaves out of account this crucial lack in Cicero as a statesman. It also falls between two stools: it will afford little new information to the Latin scholar, and it is so unnecessarily dull and ill-arranged that it will seduce the attention of few laymen. Cicero wrote more freely about himself than any other man whose works have come down to us. Beside his self-revelations, those of Rousseau are merely special pleadings. He shouldn't have been a hero to his valet. But he was. His slaves risked their lives to save him after his proscription. His secretary devoted the remainder of his life to publishing his works. His friends sorrowed and the republic fell. It is unfortunate that Mr. Richards should have had at his command only indifferent English in which to celebrate Cicero's magnificent career and what Erasmus called "the divine felicity of his style."

The Regional Approach to National Social Planning. By Howard W. Odum.

Regional Reconstruction: A Way Out for the South. By Rupert B. Vance. Published by the Foreign Policy Association and the University of North Carolina Press.

Both Dr. Odum, who is director of the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina in addition to his other distinctions, and Dr. Vance, who is the author of that immensely interesting and valuable volume "Human Geography of the South," understand economic principles and are thoroughly acquainted with the South. One recognizes their competence but at the same time feels that there may not be time for their recommendations to be carried out. As Dr. Odum says, national social planning is an alternative to chaos, revolution, industrial oligarchy, or fascism. One asks whether one of these might not be a more desirable alternative, and also whether it is not too late for any choice to be made at all. Begging these questions, the authors argue well the case for regional, as against national or sectional, planning. And no region is better adapted to such social planning or needs it more than the portion of the South consisting of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Arkansas. Dr. Vance's survey is of the utmost value to anybody concerned with the social problems that have grown up about the share-cropping system of the cotton belt. Dr. Odum proposes only, as the first step, "two six-year priority schedules, practically geared to regional adaptations, not only stressing natural resources and public works but featuring cultural backgrounds as well." Dr. Vance, looking beyond this, advocates "farm ownership and the abandonment of monoculture, the one-crop system." Neither study goes far enough; but both make it clear that something must be done, and at once.

The Lincoln Legend. By Roy P. Basler. Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.50.

In this book Mr. Basler has made a short but interesting excursion into the field of historical criticism. Lincoln, he believes, still "lives in the mind of the average American" largely as a myth, and abroad, among the more aspiring, he symbolizes freedom, and triumph over poverty and difficulties. Mr. Basler's critiques of biographies from Holland and Herndon to Barton and Beveridge are sufficiently convincing to justify his conclusion that Lincoln is still unrevealed and that his biography is still to be written. Partly, this is because history "is a strange creation." Given a "sufficiently large sequence of facts to choose from, the historian can prove anything that seems true." With regard to Lincoln, Mr. Basler's thesis is especially important. The same legend-making forces among the people that have buried the real Lincoln "under a mass of untruths" have also clothed him in truths that a study of the facts of his life could not have disclosed. This special point of view has not been grasped by other writers on Lincoln with the clarity of the author of this book. Nor, in the opinion of the present reviewer, has the genius of Lincoln had as competent treatment elsewhere as it is given in Mr. Basler's compact summary of the positive and negative impressions which Lincoln's personality awakened in those who have spoken and written about him.

Contributors to This Issue

ALBERT MAYER is a New York architect who has long been interested in the housing problem.

JAMES H. GRAY is a Canadian newspaperman.

ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ has recently resigned as legislative representative of the Teachers' Union.

B. J. WIDICK is an Akron newspaperman.

JAMES BURNHAM is professor of philosophy at Washington Square College, New York University.

MARK VAN DOREN is well known as poet and critic.

GEORGE GENZMER is lecturer in English and librarian at Bard College, Columbia University.

ERSKINE CALDWELL Says:

"There is no magazine in which I would rather appear than The ANVIL!"

The ANVIL

The Proletarian Fiction Magazine
A Bi-Monthly Founded in May, 1933

Edited by Jack Conroy, Michael Gold, Walter Snow and Clinton Simpson

CONTRIBUTORS

NELSON ALGREN
BENJAMIN APPEL
SANORA BABB
J. S. BALCH
ERSKINE CALDWELL
A. E. CLEMENTS
BEN FIELD
JAMES T. FARRELL
LANGSTON HUGHES
JOSEPHINE JOHNSON
JOSEPH KALAR
HARRY KERMIT
TILLIE LERNER
MERIDEL LE SUEUR
SAUL LEVITT
LOUIS MAMET
PETER QUINCE
HOWARD RUSHMORE

SPECIAL OFFER—8 Issues for $1.

The ANVIL, 5431 Nottingham Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.

How SMART is YOUR CHILD?

FREE TEST!

Deals with Rearing Children from Crib to College

THE Parents' Magazine has prepared a series of tests for you to try on your child. This series contains tests for babies 3, 6 and 9 months old, for toddlers from 1 to 2½, and 2½ to 5, and for children from 5 to 6, 6½ to 9, 10 to 12, 13 to 15, and 16 to 18. A FREE Test will be sent to anyone who accepts the special offer made below. More than a third of a million conscientious mothers read The Parents' Magazine for the latest and best authoritative information on the rearing of children from crib to college. The leading experts on child health, child psychology, education and recreation advise readers each month on all the problems of child rearing which confront every home in which there are children. It tells about the best movies, books, toys, fashion foods for children of various ages. The magazine is published with the official cooperation of four great universities and more than 50 of the leading authorities on children. A Special Introductory Offer of eight big 25c issues for $1.00 and the FREE test for your child is available for a short time only. Be sure to let us know the age of your child so that we can send you the right test. Don't delay! Act today!!

THE PARENTS' MAGAZINE, 9 East 40th St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

An American Tragedy

AT "Winterset" (Martin Beck Theater) the curtain rises on a stage of somber but breath-taking beauty. To the right the huge concrete pier of a bridge lifts itself sheer into the darkness above, and to the left a sullen block of tenements balances the opposing mass. In the remote gloom of these lower depths the solid foundation of the proud bridge equates itself with the dismal despair of the tenements, and the fact adds meaning to the pure plastic beauty of the forms. Physically and spiritually the foundations upon which the city rests are seen from the perspective of those who crawl about their bases, and it is not often that the creative possibilities of stage design have been so convincingly demonstrated.

During the three or four seconds which immediately succeeded the rising of the curtain, many spectators must have had time to reflect that if Maxwell Anderson's play could live up to the promise of Jo Mielziner's set it would win for itself a very high place in our dramatic literature. Long before the final curtain went down, the audience had divided itself into two camps, and I have no doubt that critical opinions on this play will be as fiercely irreconcilable as they were last year during the discussion of Mr. O'Casey's "Within the Gates." Then I was among those who turned thumbs down, and in recent years I have also been among those who found in Mr. Anderson's romantic historical dramas something pretentiously literary. But in the present case I have no desire to hedge. "Winterset" seems to me bold, original, and engrossing. In its most general aspect the play might be described as an attempt to treat some of the material of contemporary life in a manner more richly imaginative than the method of realism permits. Thus, while the time is the present and the plot one which might serve for a tragic melodrama, the whole emphasis of the treatment is such as to stress the eternal rather than the local aspects of the passions involved and to lay the emphasis less upon the action itself than upon its reverberations in the souls.

Long before the play begins, a radical agitator (vaguely reminiscent of Vanzetti) has been railroaded to death by a court which shared the popular determination to fix the guilt of murder upon a man whom it had other reasons to hate. More recently, a college professor, reopening the case, has pointed the finger of suspicion at a gangster just released from prison, and thus a ghost has been raised to plague those who had had a part in the now almost forgotten events. The key to the mystery is held by a young witness lost in the obscurity of the lower depths, and upon him converge all those most deeply concerned—the actual murderer, determined at all cost to prevent the truth from coming to light, the outcast son of the man who paid the penalty for the crime he did not commit, and, finally, the presiding judge, now driven out of his wits by the unsuccessful effort to convince himself that he had done only what duty compelled him to do. Obviously there is in all this no lack of exciting action or of opportunities for direct socio-political argument. But both are subordinated as they would be in a classic tragedy to a brooding and poetic treatment of the themes which the action suggests—namely, the nature of guilt and of justice and the meaning of revenge.

Much of the dialogue is cast in the form of blank verse, and the fact is of course significant chiefly for what it implies. It means that the author, in claiming the right to make his characters speak more pointedly and more richly than ordinary people do, claims at the same time the right to make them think and feel more richly too. It means that even the lowest of his characters is, like the characters in Shakespeare, permitted to be both a poet and a philosopher, limited in certain ways no doubt by the limitations of his soul, but by virtue of poetic and philosophical gifts, capable of defining and expressing that soul with the clarity and intensity of the poet and the philosopher. It means, in other words, that the play is at least capable of being more interesting than any other kind of play just because only poets and philosophers are capable of realizing and feeling to its full depth the meaning of the experiences through which they pass.

Mr. Anderson's play immediately suggests comparison with two—and only two—other recent plays, "Within the Gates" and Robert Sherwood's "The Petrified Forest." In a very general way both aimed at something of the same sort, but neither is precisely comparable since Mr. Sherwood kept considerably closer to realistic melodrama while Mr. O'Casey, abandoning representation entirely, wrote exclusively in terms of symbolism. More significant, perhaps, would be a comparison between "Winterset" and Mr. Anderson's previous play "Gods of the Lightning," which dealt specifically and in the mood of direct social protest with the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Doubtless many will argue that the former was the better or at least the more "useful" play, but to me the contention would seem to indicate a fantastic misconception of the whole nature of literature and drama. Probably "Winterset" would never have been written if Mr. Anderson had not concerned himself with the famous case. But if the earlier play represents the immediate reaction of the citizen, "Winterset" is the product of a poet's brooding. It represents no change of opinion; the social protest is still here if one cares to look for it. But here also is that deeper penetration into thoughts and passions and souls which it is the dramatist's business to achieve. In the production two performances are outstanding: Burgess Meredith, as the son, is both fiery and ingratiatingly youthful; Richard Bennet, as the judge, is both brilliant and subtle.

"If This Be Treason," which the Theater Guild has produced at the Music Box, deserves a longer discussion than I have space to give it. It quite frankly exists for nothing except the problem which it poses, but the problem is clearly and concisely stated and I found it interesting enough in itself to make the piece worth an earnest recommendation. Suppose that a newly elected President, committed unconditionally to peace, takes office upon the eve of a conflict which his predecessor has done all in his power to make inevitable. The ultimatum to Japan has been rejected, the Philippines have been attacked, and the American fleet has set sail. Is there anything that he could do; is it ever true that war is inevitable? The play (by John Haynes Holmes and Reginald Lawrence) sets out to show what one President, faced with such a situation, actually did. There is no need to recount the plot, and the point does not, I think, lie primarily in the way in which this particular set of circumstances works out. It lies rather in the play's clear demonstration of the fact that it is only a figure of speech to say, under any circumstances, that only one course of action—a declaration of war—is possible. One can always refuse to fight and it may be soberly argued that no possible consequences could be worse than war itself. The piece has been expertly directed and the performances are all excellent, especially those by McKay Morris as the President, Armina Marshall as his wife, and Hunter Gardner as the secretary.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

"Remember the Day" (National Theater) is a nostalgic study of a young boy's infatuation for his grammar-school teacher. It is a moving little play, sensitively performed, but it falters for lack of convincing dramatic sequence. It should be enjoyed, however, by those who found pleasure in "Ah, Wilderness" and "One Sunday Afternoon," for it has the same kind of tenuous charm.

M. G.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED